

# L I V I N G

CONFERENCE NUMBER

THE ROLE AND FUNCTION  
OF THE  
FAMILY  
IN A  
DEMOCRACY

Winter, 1940



## TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTORY ORIENTATION .....	1
<i>Adolf Meyer, M.D.</i>	
DEMOCRACY AND THE FAMILY .....	5
<i>Una Bernard Sait</i>	
THE FAMILY AS A DYNAMIC FACTOR IN AMERICAN SOCIETY .....	8
<i>Sidney E. Goldstein</i>	
TYPES OF FAMILIES—COMMUNIST, FASCIST, DEMOCRATIC .....	12
<i>Carle C. Zimmerman</i>	
THE FAMILY AS CULTURAL AGENT .....	16
<i>Lawrence K. Frank</i>	
THE FAMILY, THE LAW AND THE STATE .....	20
<i>Max Rheinstein</i>	
BIOLOGICAL BASIS OF THE FAMILY .....	21
<i>Carl G. Hartman</i>	
ECONOMIC BASES OF FAMILY LIFE .....	24
<i>William F. Ogburn</i>	
FROM THE CONFERENCES: ABSTRACT OF PAPER .....	29
The Role of the Family Agency in Counselling	
<i>Helen C. White</i>	
NEWS AND NOTES	
National Regional and State Conferences .....	30
Meetings and Events .....	33
Personal Notes .....	34

---

LIVING is published quarterly during the months of February, May, August and November at 450 Ahnaip Street, Menasha, Wis., by The National Conference on Family Relations. Application has been made for entry as second class matter at the Post Office at Menasha, Wis.

Membership (which includes \$1.50 for the magazine, LIVING, and full participation in all activities) is \$2.00 per year. Those who wish to join should send their application to: THE NATIONAL CONFERENCE ON FAMILY RELATIONS, 1126 E. 59th Street, Chicago, Illinois.



# Introductory Orientation

By ADOLF MEYER, M.D.

*President, National Conference on Family Relations*

WE ARE here assembled for the second meeting of the National Conference on Family Relations. Professor Paul Sayre, Iowa State University, Professor E. W. Burgess, University of Chicago, and Dr. Sidney R. Goldstein, New York Conference on Marriage and the Family, were the moving spirits who brought us together a year ago. There had been a number of movements in which the interest in the family had asserted itself as a live and irrepressible concern, always sponsored by a few pioneers who had the courage to focus their attention on the cradles and settings from which the human individual arises, again to find the mate and to form anew a setting from which civilization recruits new centers of growth and social existence and performance.

The first National Conference of last year constituted itself from very heterogeneous fields: students and workers in sociology and economics, administrators of public welfare, students of eugenics, and of marriage and family counselling, and family law, and child study and youth problems, a few physicians and a few representatives of churches—all concerned with the entity we call *family*, thus showing clearly the highly specific but also ramified character of our topic. The *economist* goes under a term directly pointing to the *household* (*oikos* the house and habitation and *nomos*, custom, law, order) but largely dealing with matters of the finances today; so great has become the importance of money in this practical task of living, even in the practice of extreme communism; the *sociologist* comes in as the student of society and the origin and evolution of the institutions and functioning of *human groups*. The student of the *child*, and the *educator*, come into this field from various angles and viewpoints as psychologist, teacher, and parent dealing with what the human individual goes through. An important contribution comes from the students of *marriage and procreation* (marital pointing to the male as husband, somewhat prejudicially but in harmony with the giving of names). The *social worker*, the *lawyer*, the *physician* and the *minister*, the *anthropologist* and *ethnologist* and the *historian*—they all run into the problems and special issues determined by the institution of the family as the place for the fulfilment of married life: the problems of family-formation and family-relationships and of the conditions under which generations follow each other, with the raising and training of children from babyhood to adolescence and, naturally above all, the prime of

*adult life*, the period of reproduction and the culmination of practical individual and social life.

This enumeration alone shows clearly that we are confronted with a topic difficult to circumscribe, but one deeply significant. It may resist any simple mathematical definition, and range from the historical family-tree of blood relationship and family-name, to the ever new aggregate that forms a specific household under a roof or in an apartment: the *husband and wife and children and dependents* as a *group of interdependents*, through the factors that *bring and hold them together*.

Man has been very slow to allow himself to submit to the process of *scientific and truly science-making study*. The family in our own midst as a going concern has only in the last few decades received active consideration when it started to be beset by problems of economic, social and existential maintenance, in which today civilization herself is involved and challenged. Mrs. Helen Bosanquet, in 1906, Sumner, Hart, Professor Goodsell (1928), Professor and Mrs. Groves and more recently Folsom, Nimkoff, Mrs. Sait and others dealing with the family, and the students of marriage, such as L. H. Morgan (1869), Howard (1904 and 1914) and Westermarck (1921) and Briffault (*The Mothers*, 1927) and the students of the child, and of personality have given us increasingly solid material, while after all, most of us are largely *incidentally* active as practitioners rather than as specialists.

The domain is, on the one hand, an immensely practical and human one, which has been exposed to all the disorganizing as well as constructive influences of the modern trends of mechanization and speed, and, on the other hand, the available sciences suffer under the fact that they are unduly closely patterned after the system of physics and chemistry, so that narrow and one-sided conceptions of official science have as frequently become a hindrance as have the hangovers of tradition and of prebiological religions (ties) and philosophies (systems of wisdom), and psychologies of uncertain relation to biology—either in contrast to it, split off by parallelism or belonging to it in various forms of “behavior.” According to the extent to which our leading institutions of higher learning persist in a failure to create frankly a well defined “science of man,” and allow large numbers of future leaders of man to graduate *without* having brought together in a well rounded form the *natural sciences* as well as the *humanities* and vice versa, many will assume authority in matters of responsibilities for human life for



the handling of which they are no better qualified than the uneducated. And if our institutions of learning fail us, the young and the non-erudite will also fail to develop a uniformly objective rendering of the facts duly inclusive of the "subjective" features. Each period of life and all walks of life need a balance and integration of *natural history* and *cultural* knowledge which will not come from uncritical modes of browsing and shopping around and talking with inadequate habits of control and verification, by reduction to terms of experience and experiments of nature and man.

Brought together from all kinds of fields, we are no longer primarily concerned with exhortation and propaganda of philosophies and indoctrinations, but aim at presenting the facts and the operation and control of the organization and maintenance of *adult types*, in the form of distinctive samples, with their respective patterns and role and influence and effectiveness, with an emphasis this year on a full sense of their *function in a democracy*—in our type of social-political organization.

A good share of difficulty no doubt lies in the deplorable *lack of agreement* on the basic facts and their interrelations in the field of human nature and functioning. Many of these facts are much better handled by practical critical common sense than by the erudite, who should learn first what we all can agree on, free of doctrinal tangles, and to prejudicial splitting up and fragmentation, and as close as possible to the vigor and at the same time sound criticism of the common sense of the proverbial man from Missouri. Such devitalizing conundrums as are passed on from would-be scientific splits and arbitrary definitions and rules affect the field of human science as detrimentally as the old hangover of superseded doctrines.

Few people are aware of how much progress has been made, particularly by a few of our American pioneers of thought and scientific work, toward bringing the rigidly objective sciences and the more intrinsically subject-dependent cultural and logical sciences on common ground, much closer to critical common sense than is adequately realized. What Charles S. Peirce, William James, John Dewey and Harvey Robinson have contributed to Occidental thought and science and especially to the science dealing with human data in a blending of so-called natural and humanistic sciences is infinitely closer again to what any intelligent person can understand and practice, and gives us the facts and methods to work with "the whole of man and not only parts of him," making clearer what place is assigned to the various special sciences in a unified and creative science of man.

The main difficulty of study may well lie in the justified demand for *privacy* with which our personal and familial data will always have to be guarded. But there are also great technical difficulties. Both, I feel, can

gradually be done justice to. Indirect questionnaire procedures may still have to take the place of open and direct attack, lending themselves to inferences from indirect data and evaluations, but with increasing *objectivity* and more than merely descriptive statistical methods. Terman in *Psychological Factors in Marital Happiness* and, lately, E. W. Burgess and L. S. Cottrell in *Predicting Success and Failure in Marriage* have made excellent studies of evaluations of both facts and methods in the direction of *predictability of happiness* on the basis of questionnaires. With a growing confidence in the value of such work there is also a growing tolerance of sufficiently direct access to controllable, necessarily quasi-biographic material, with direct knowledge derived from actual questions on ground of frank collaboration with the subjects used and problems that call for a study and with a sorting out of the data. Where the investigator (and enough of the goal) is known and the material is adequately guarded, one can count on an increasing amount of frankness and collaboration.

To serve for statistics for any kind of full-fledged research, I should use items on which we can obtain cooperation in *pointed, compact biographic records*, controlled by competent personal study and check-up, preserving the sense for dynamic relations. If our human material is to be maximally valid, our records will as far as possible have to be collected with due intention and pertinence to special inquiry, informing and useful, in the first place, for the immediate issues intended but also of service for broader progress and general validity. We have to develop *generally acceptable methodology* adequate to answer both specific and wider *requirements*, with a scope to be agreed upon from time to time by committees made up of *interested* representatives of the various sciences of natural history and cultural and methodological logical-philosophical nature involved in dealing with individuals and groups and their very human data. There has to be a general consensus on the nature and importance of person and family material—agreement on what we can agree on, with data to be obtained under a principle of specificity rather than mere check-offs on blanks, which often tell us nothing of the all important interrelations. Our problem is to determine what would be the necessary minima to make human data generally acceptable and valuable, and also worthy of protection from misuse, as basic material for study and preservation. What would the various workers consider necessary to make personality-records fit and adequately informing and dependable and worth preserving for use? How can we replace mere check-offs of specified items on blanks (justly so named) by *pointed concise records, controlled by competent personal interviews*, preserving the biographic time and history relations without which it is so nearly impossible to judge the type of dynamic pertinence and



the probability or provable certainty of the given data?

It is of the utmost importance that we should adapt our methods of analysis to human or any other complex material with far more attention to what the facts are as found with due respect for the settings. I like to explain the principle under the term of *scrutiny*, following the sense of the word and its implications. In one of his articles on the difficulties of understanding the New Deal, Frank Kent referred to a Negro preacher speaking to his congregation of his desire to "unscrew the inscrutable." The lapse in this etymological venture made me aware of my own ignorance of the meaning and origin of the intriguing term and led me to the helpful significance of the root—the meaning of *scruta* being "fragments and breakage" intelligible only when traced to what they had belonged to and were made of, the task of the rag-picker who figured so often in the children's books and novels offered us in my early years, in a period in which thrift but also discoveries often rewarded the one who sorted out what today we are apt to burn or to surrender to mere wholesale salvaging. Instead of mere analysis and synthesis, the *scrutiny* of "*scruta*" does remarkably well without destructive dismemberment what experience and wisdom urge us to do with the raw material of any observation, especially our human ones, with a *threefold obligation*: (1) examination of the object or datum as found, before picking it to pieces, (2) obligatory determination of *what the fragment belongs to* or is a part of, to be intelligible with responsible interrelationships, and (3) determination of what the "fragment" is made of in the terms of analysis and synthesis making up the usual concern of science, but too often and tragically neglecting the frequently all-important issue of belonging. This triple rule actually is sound advice not only in sociology but in science generally and especially where the history-making processes of biological and specifically human nature are involved, and where the pertinence to larger wholes or integrates often gives the most important light. The data, further, have to stand the test of the *operational formula of all science*: (1) specification of concrete samples, (2) with the conditions under which they occur, (3) the *facts and factors* that enter, (4) their operation and (5) the *range of results and their modifiability*—the best rule to be applied to all our Occidental quasi-experimental working, including also the points of concern in *family study*. A great deal of the difficulties in the sciences belonging to biology and sociology has come from the neglect to consider what the items under study *belong to* and depend on for their operation and very existence and any critical and helpful understanding.

With a frank determination to apply these principles, including systematically the consideration of the *concepts of integrates* and pertinent categories of data, which allows us to treat objectively also the subjective organization

of man, science can remedy very serious lapses and deficiencies and excessive splittings which have stood in the way of doing justice to the correction of tradition and the progress of strict science and its role in actual life. Above all things, the *methodology of scrutiny* opens up the right to study human data as all other data, as found and alive, instead of just any static dissection into no longer living and livable constructs. We can dispense with a number of old and new bugaboos, and one of them is the obsession of trying to get exclusive salvation from dissection alone, and that of expecting enlightenment and guidance for action only from reduction of the "data as found" to physics and chemistry or only to structure and to structure function and elements, which may fail utterly to show the genetic and dynamic characteristics rising above merely static concepts. We rather urge reduction of the data to terms of "experiments of nature," or experiments of events, with due respect also for the historical motivations. We owe to *present-day conceptions of objectivity* that we should include also the verifiable data of "*subjective*" functioning, the possibility of doing justice to any type of accessible data, biological and specifically psychobiological, humanistic and naturalistic, according to the principle that anything of sufficient importance is open to investigation—anything the presence or absence and operation or non-operation of which makes a difference. The selection and grouping of the data demand experience and the rights of application of experimental and observational scrutiny, with the concepts and methods devised and adapted to the facts instead of forcing the facts into frames devised for different integrates.

We have to realize that the concept of family is almost a negation of what one usually calls family in our patriarchal sense and pedigrees. Each specific family within the family that carries the name of the father's father introduces on equal terms the mothers, not only as if they were mere culture tubes, the father being dominant in effectiveness in the long run only because of the emphasis on *persistent recurrence of this male stock in each generation* and no longer just because of the power over life and death and property that was inherent in the father in the patriarchal organization. In a matriarchic series the reverse would be the case and the persistent reiteration of the mother's line kept up. Every family in one sense is the upshot of two families in the larger sense of the term. *Rudderless promiscuity* would theoretically give up also this reiteration of the same leading effect, male or female, and the best thoughtfulness of both sides. Even where selection can be made within strata of sound and healthy and commensurate combinations, there still is in the cultural product a great relative dominance of *situational factors*. As a matter of fact, present-day family has to constitute itself on special



principles of closer interindividual cohesion. In either case historical factors cannot be ignored although their effects would not be carried by heredity, but largely by the factor of biodynamics, causal and motivational, and far less predictability and stereotyped order than what is also hereditarily determinable. It is the history-making and cultural dynamics including and in part determining the heredity, that prove to be the *forward-looking* constructively useful factor of such vital importance in the whole problem today, in addition to the advances of the control of the more backward looking and basic structure and structure-functions of the special organs and their functions.

There are many conditions in our present-day interest in specific family units within larger families, which we want to devote this meeting to, the family and its role in a democracy in the setting in which the family is the basic social unit.

The two days of discussions of the *Role and Function of the Family in a Democracy* find us in the midst of a time when there is an especial need that the would-be leaders of human destiny should prove themselves as knowing both the capacity and the limitations of their own nature and that of the human individual generally, if we are to emerge from the present state of uncertainty and the unbelievable unpreparedness and non-dependability of the manipulators of human and political rights and policies, and from an almost hopeless blundering along in the choice and self-appointment of leaders. With the perfection of means of power and destruction, the guides and leaders of the large units and the small units of mankind are more than ever sorely in need of a wise regulation of their use of power and resources, in behalf of rational, planned and constructive performance bringing the nature and capacities and *responsibilities* of man into a better balance.

True to democratic ideals, I have to emphasize my conviction that we have every reason and justification for adhering to the general principle of *reporting and stating facts which we can share with the man in the street*, as long as we realize that our statements are always essentially *referential and indicative* and that they cannot make familiarity with the factual material and its dynamics unnecessary. In other words, in order to carry out the formulation indicated in my statement, one has to be fully aware of the logical implications of the *psychobiologic-ergasiological mode of presentation and thinking*. *Objectivity is the basic principle*, and the *formulation is planned as a semantic verbalization*, as close to the relations, actualities and the means of rendering as possible, and under the constant test of the objective control by performance in quasi-experimental control of the components of the experiments. We deal with items according to the *claims and rules of the integrationist*. We need

the courage to grasp outstanding entities and data, their formulation, and their test by execution and performance. Out of this may arise not a slavish laissez-faire philosophy but an active, creative and inventive spirit of investigation.

I should consider it our first and leading task to furnish such a marshalling of facts and methods and perspectives that *each individual*, the lowly and the best endowed, the youngest and the oldest can derive a sense of actuality and dependability. It is vitally important that *even the child* in his way can get a sense of family-formation, a sense of its unity and also its separateness in sex and its belonging, in keeping with the simplicity and slow expansion of grasp and use and capacity, without its having to be obtruded by details belonging to fields and principles beyond its capacity and practice; we have to respect the sphere and life of childhood. The same holds for the adolescent's enrichment of vision and of participation in both opportunity and responsibility and his protection from overstimulation before he or she has attained the understanding and capacity for self regulation. And the same holds, above all things, for the use and fruition of the full-fledged attainment in *adult life*, according to capacity for "life as learning and progression," in various ranges, again, of participation and balance of opportunity and obligation.

We owe the program of this National Conference, bringing together the upshot also of the organized regional conferences, to the untiring efforts of Professor Burgess and Dr. Goldstein and many cooperative spirits. Very wisely there are some representative prepared addresses giving all those attending the conference a setting of arresting surveys. But the main stress is laid on the conjoint work of committees or group work with the freest possible exchange of the experience and thought and creative spirit of the participants. Many of us would no doubt like to sit in with all the topical groups. The results will be shared in tomorrow's afternoon sessions.

It is a great pleasure to meet with a group of workers who have the courage and determination to gather for such a topic as *The Role and Function of the Family in a Democracy*. Both family and democracy are very general terms. I take it for granted that what brings us together is increasingly specific: discussion not merely of statistical figures and concepts, but specific issues, problems and desiderata, more or less definitely live questions and principles. Moreover, the discussions come more and more from specific investigations of specific collection of data, not from mere impressions and generalities. Instead of the elimination of the concepts of (relative) spontaneity and responsibility and subject as well as object development and mechanistic statistical fatalism there is a return to new interest in the factors that make for self and group order and a sound morality based on individual and social fact.



# Democracy and the Family

By UNA BERNARD SAIT

Department of Philosophy, Claremont College

THE family is a system of social relations springing from the biological roots of sex and reproduction. Today, as always and everywhere, it provides a way of combining certain interrelated functions. Central among these are the biological and educational functions of *parenthood*: the means by which racial and cultural continuity are assured, and the biological and social heritage transmitted to future generations. For human parenthood does not only mean the procreation of children; it also means their *nurture*. And the family, however supplemented by other educational agencies, remains the fundamental formative influence in the development of mind and character.

It may, perhaps, have been one of the earliest human discoveries that the protection and nurture of children, to be fully successful, demands the coöperation of father and mother. Moreover, through what we call marriage, the family provides for a relatively stable and a socially valuable form of sex expression. Here is another essential function of the family; while still another is found in the fact that a continuing relation between husband and wife makes possible their further coöperation in the maintenance of a *home*. For the environment of family life is, typically, what we mean by home. And we mean not only the material setting; but, more significantly, we mean what may best be described as a spiritual atmosphere: the distilled essence, as it were, of the personal relations involved in family life.

The inner substance of family life, today as always, is composed of the reciprocal relations between husband and wife, and parents and children. But in any given society these relations conform to an accepted pattern, which is part of the general cultural pattern, itself a product of social and economic conditions, of custom and law, of tradition and belief and prevailing social attitudes. The rôle of each member of the family is thus determined, not only by his or her natural status in the family,—as father and husband, mother and wife, older or younger child; that is by the relations of each individual to the others,—but by his or her status in a socially sanctioned pattern. As a result, wherever the hold of custom and tradition is strong, and cultural patterns remain relatively stable, the family is firmly held together through the coercion of external forces,—through the binding ties of economic compulsions and religious sanctions, and through the pressure of public opinion.

The patriarchal family, typical of Western civilization,

affords an outstanding example of a family in which coherence, stability, and strength are assured through coercive control. The accord existing between the family members is derived from conformity to a pattern, irrespective of deeper ties of sympathy and affection. Family organization is maintained intact, even at the cost of the individual development of the family members, in particular, of the wife and daughters.

In form, at least, the family today is still patriarchal. Yet, in democratic countries, and above all here in America, the patriarchal pattern is in process of dissolution. Social changes have disrupted the external framework holding the family together. No longer sustained from without it must now depend on its own resources. Here is one chief reason for the instability of family life today. And a second reason is found in the fact that constructive forces leading to a new and *democratic pattern of family relations* have only very recently begun to gather strength. Only in the last few years have we realized that cohesion and stability may,—and *must* under present conditions—be achieved from *within*, through the inherent strength of harmonious family relations, so interwoven as to reinforce one another.

The present situation of the family is the result of a long evolutionary process, in which some of the former functions of the family, or certain aspects of these functions, have been taken over by other, more specialized, agencies: the state, the church, the school, and the factory. *But the central and essential functions of the family not only endure, but present conditions make possible their fuller and freer development.* Intelligent parenthood, successful marriage, and happy home life are now more generally possible than they have ever been before.

Let me attempt to justify such an optimistic statement. In the first place, family life is being freed from much that is irrelevant to its intrinsic character, much that has hindered and warped the individual development of the family members and prevented mutual understanding. Women are being freed from burdensome and impersonal household drudgery. What, for example, is the intrinsic connection between scrubbing clothes or floors and the personal contribution of a wife and mother to her husband and children? And women are being freed from involuntary and incessant childbearing,—a fact of far-reaching significance. Until recently, innumerable children had to be born that the few might survive. As late as the seventies of last century, nearly a quarter of all the children



born in New York City died in their first year. And even for those more fortunate women whose lives have been relatively free from drudgery, "bearing and burying children was hard work," to quote one mother of whom Cotton Mather wrote: a mother, moreover, who died too young to qualify for inclusion in his "catalog of fruitful vines by the side of the house." One of the latter had borne twenty-two children "of whom she buried fourteen sons and six daughters."

Children, too, are gradually being freed from exploitation and harmful repression, from the misuse of parental authority and the molding of their lives in conformity to pre-determined patterns. Even girls are now treated more as individuals and not so much as members of an undifferentiated group, destined to one traditional rôle.

As for men, if less obvious, it is none the less true that they too are beginning to achieve a new freedom: a freedom from attitudes which result in emotional immaturity, and hinder the development of harmonious family relations. Genuine companionship between husband and wife is possible only in so far as a man is free from traditional prejudices in favor of masculine dominance, and no longer seeks assurance in a sense of masculine superiority. Let me hasten to add that a mature relationship between a man and a woman demands emotional maturity on the part of the woman, no less than on the part of the man: it demands of both a degree of development of mind and character, and a sense of social responsibility; but, in addition, it demands their reciprocal acceptance of the equal human worth of men and women.

At the risk of seeming to dwell too long upon this point let me make one further comment on the tradition of the wholesale superiority of men, and inferiority of women. I have a double justification for this emphasis in a discussion involving both the family and democracy. Much marital discord today is due to the equivocal psychological relationship between men and women; and, again, the success of democracy is dependent on the *acceptance of differences without adverse discrimination*. As a matter of fact, a prejudice in favor of the wholesale superiority of one sex, or one class or race or other social group, is utterly illogical. An individual may be superior to another with respect to one or more specific traits, and groups may be compared statistically, but only with reference to specific traits.

So far as the relationship between men and women is concerned, man's actual dominance in the family and in society has been due very largely to one fact: the ceaseless preoccupation of women with their numerous children. From this fact is derived the fundamental dichotomy between masculine and feminine rôles; the lives of women having been absorbed in domesticity, while men were free to roam abroad, to hunt and to fight, to engage in politics and statecraft; in a word, to lead lives full of varied interest and full of opportunity for spectacular deeds. No

wonder the work of men came to be regarded as of far greater importance than the work of women; and in any social group, whatever the men do, even if it be work performed by women in other social groups, it is sure to be considered of greater consequence. There are, of course, subsidiary reasons for the tradition of masculine superiority; but I must not pursue this bypath any further.

Only recently have women been released from the excessive burdens formerly entailed by motherhood. No wonder, then, that traditional attitudes still linger, and stand in the way of coöperation between men and women.

Let me return to the new potentialities inherent in family life today. Its release from restrictive influences is the result of scientific discoveries and inventions, which have secured increasing control over natural forces. And this freedom is being won at a time when further scientific advances have provided new opportunities for the development of the essential functions of the family. Recent progress in the life sciences is making possible, for the first time, *an objective understanding of human nature*. In this fact lies the second and chief reason we have for optimism. For the first time it is becoming possible to consider the family from a scientific and experimental standpoint; and deliberately to plan a democratic pattern of family relations in the interests of individual development; always remaining alert to modify the details of this pattern on the basis of results, and in the light of newer knowledge.

We are challenged, then, as never before, to do our utmost to release and develop the potentialities of family life. This conference affords encouraging evidence of the varied resources already available, and of a common interest which is *not abstract and academic*, but is inspired by a common purpose and by dedication to a common task. The significance of this task becomes even more apparent, when we realize that the future not only of the family, but of democracy, is dependent upon its successful promotion.

The present crisis in world affairs is forcing us to reconsider the meaning of democracy. The very survival of democracy is threatened, and its fundamental principles are scorned and rejected in the name of totalitarian ideologies. We are obliged to admit that, after all, democracy, except in a limited sense, is no accomplished fact; and that even in America we have made far less progress in developing a democratic way of life than most of us had hitherto assumed.

For the democratic way of life is rooted in a steadfast faith in the potentialities of human nature, and involves whole-hearted acceptance of a fundamental ethical principle: the principle of the *intrinsic worth of personality*. As John Dewey points out in *Freedom and Culture*, the book published on his eightieth birthday last October, "the cause of democratic freedom is the cause of the full-



est possible realization of human potentialities." (P. 129.) Each individual, whatever his capacity or vocation, whatever his differences from others, must be regarded with equal respect as a human being, and be provided with full opportunity for self-realization. And, since the democratic way of life requires the fullest possible measure of coöperation between these disparate yet interdependent individuals, no effort must be spared to promote mutual understanding and to widen the area of common interests.

What then is the immediate obligation of those who would serve the cause of democracy? May I once again quote, and partly paraphrase, the words of John Dewey? We must, he says, "examine every one of the phases of human activity to ascertain what effects it has in release, maturing and fruition of the potentialities of human nature." And, having ascertained "how all the constituents of our existing culture are operating," we must "see to it that whenever and wherever needed they be modified." (Pp. 125-126.) Democracy is thus no easy road, but a way of life which "places the greatest burden of responsibility upon the greatest number of human beings." (P. 129.) "With the founders of American democracy, the claims of democracy were inherently one with the demands of a just and equal morality. . . . The question of what is involved in self-governing methods is now much more complex. But for this very reason, the task of those who retain belief in democracy is to revive and maintain in full vigor the original conviction of the intrinsic moral nature of democracy, now stated in ways congruous with present conditions of culture. We have advanced far enough to say that democracy is a way of life. We have yet to realize that it is a way of personal life and one which provides a moral standard for personal conduct." (P. 130.)

If we consider by what means democracy may become a way of personal life, and so find fuller expression in the conduct of individuals and the institutions of society, our thoughts turn inevitably to education. Education for democracy does not, however, mean indoctrination, nor can it involve any form of coercion. The inherent character of democracy demands the complete abandonment of all pernicious short cuts to consensus and efficiency. Our only direct means of educating for democracy is to educate through *experiences in democratic living*. And we may also, in word and deed, so interpret the cause of democracy as to inspire the enthusiasm of youth and their devotion to its service.

The recent Congress on Education for Democracy gave evidence of an awareness of the new problems confronted by our schools. But, while the potential power of schools is great, the potential power of the family is far greater; and for three reasons. In the first place, the educational influence of the family is fundamental; nurture, from the moment of birth, is a basic determinant of future development. Secondly, home life organized along coöperative

lines affords the most readily available opportunity for day-by-day experience in the democratic way of life. And lastly, such continuing practice in democratic living effectively fosters the growth towards full human stature of every member of the family. Accordingly, the surest means for furthering the cause of democracy is the development of a fully coöperative, or democratic, pattern of family relations.

What does this mean in concrete terms? It must be pointed out, first of all, that the democratic pattern is not a fixed plan, requiring the conformity of the family members to rôles other than those intrinsic in their natural status. On the other hand, the democratic pattern by no means implies anarchy or the relinquishment by parents of their natural authority. Social controls best become effective through parental guidance in childhood. Where the whole atmosphere of family life consistently selects certain responses and eliminates others, discipline resides in daily experience.

The democratic pattern of family relations will emerge more fully when family life comes to be regarded as an absorbing, adventurous pursuit: a pursuit whose success is dependent on the discovery of ways of living which shall promote the self-realization of each individual in the family circle, while fostering the attitudes essential to democracy. Home life affords unique opportunity for experimenting with democracy, in a group which though small, yet includes both sexes, and older and younger members, and individuals of differing temperaments and abilities. Conflicts of interests are inevitable. But mutual accommodation is always possible, and each conflict as it arises gives occasion for *discussion*,—the only democratic method for the settlement of issues. When parents and children are gathered together at table or beside the fire, or, more formally, in family councils, there are countless opportunities for discussion, in the course of which leadership may be assumed, as a matter of course, by those with fuller experience and expert knowledge. Social insight, tolerance and freedom from prejudice, objective, even scientific, habits of mind may gradually be acquired in this way. And, further, genuine coöperation is possible in a group where each member, even the youngest, is treated with equal courtesy and consideration; where, in the process of living, working, and playing together, common interests are developed in such a way as to foster a sense of responsibility, and a disposition to subordinate individual activities to the common good.

I am not attempting to describe family life in Utopia. Not only *can* these things be done, but, in some measure at least, they *are* being done in many families today. Indeed, similar procedures have been characteristic of some of the happiest families of the last few generations. Most of you will have read the biography of Mme. Curie, and

(Continued on page 35)



# The Family as a Dynamic Factor in American Society

By SIDNEY E. GOLDSTEIN

*Chairman, New York State Conference on Marriage and the Family*

THE family is advancing rapidly into the foreground of social study and concern. It is generally recognized now that the family is the basic social organization; but the relation of the family to the different sections of the social structure and the development of social programs in terms of the family has not been adequately established. This is not surprising in view of the history of social thought and social movements. During the whole of the nineteenth century individualism was the dominant social philosophy and the individual therefore became the center of social interest. For one hundred years and more we were engaged in the task of emancipating and protecting individual men and women. With the opening of the twentieth century however we began to emphasize not the individual but society and social organization. For over a generation the major stress in the larger social movements has been on the social conditions, social dislocations and social maladjustments that hamper progress. In our eagerness to emancipate the individual and in our anxiety to reconstruct the social system we have failed to give proper consideration to the fact that the individual is first of all a member of a family; and we have also failed to recognize the equally important fact that if the family is in danger the social order itself is insecure.

No institution can serve as a substitute for the family in cultivating the personality of the individual. We may delegate to the school much of the formal education of children, adolescents and adults; but the family remains a potent instrument of education for both children and their parents. No one can escape the educational influence of the home in the formation of habits, attitudes and outlooks, both during the early plastic years and also during the later years of life. We may transfer to the church and the synagogue the formal ritual of religion; but the home continues to shape the religious life of men and women as well as children even more than the religious institutions. Teachers of religion recognize this fact in the constant complaint that they cannot counteract in the synagogue and the church what children learn in the home through precept but chiefly by example. There is no institution, however, to which we can transfer or delegate the service the family renders in meeting the emotional and spiritual needs of the individual. There is no adequate substitute for the satisfaction that comes through the family of the desires, cravings and yearnings that are a natural and

legitimate part of the psychological constitution of every normal human being. Plato thought he could disband and dismiss the family from his "Republic." He provided that men and women should meet and mate during the great religious and national festivals and that the children issuing from these ephemeral associations should be adopted and reared by the State. In his later years and in his more mature Dialogues Plato recants and reestablishes the family as basic to social life even in a Utopia. With all its weaknesses and imperfections the family cultivates a more rounded and a richer personality than any other social institution.

The family on the other hand makes a contribution to social life and social progress that cannot be made by any other organization or institution. It is out of the family of today that the world of tomorrow must inevitably come. Society is not composed of men and women who come out of the void or who grow up in Orphan Asylums; but of men and women who are born into families and who come directly out of family environment and are moulded by family influence. Studies have been made repeatedly to show how even one unfit and defective family can spread its poison through a number of generations and over large geographical areas and place unbearable burdens upon society in the form of disease and insanity, delinquency and vice. Studies are also being made that reveal the contribution that sound and competent families make to society and the way in which these families enrich and vitalize the blood-stream of social life. From these families come forth men and women who extend the boundaries of human knowledge, deepen and expand the range of human experience, greaten and refine the heritage of the centuries. It is not incorrect to state that the family is one of the chief agencies through which the achievements of the past are conserved; the treasures of the present cultivated; and the endowments of the future transmitted. We can realize the truth of this statement when we consider the way in which some families have conserved and increased and transmitted merely material wealth. Other families have rendered an even greater service in conserving and cultivating and transmitting to posterity the intellectual and ethical and spiritual possessions of the race.

If the family therefore is in danger the individuals who compose the family must suffer and the social organization upon which the family rests must necessarily be unsafe.



That the family is in danger today there can be no doubt in the minds of those who know the facts. Growing tensions and discords and disruptions in family relationships; the deepening rebellion of children; the widening revolt of women; the increasing restlessness of men; the almost incredible multiplication of estrangements, separations and divorces,—these are the symptoms of a serious disorganization in family life. A recent study reveals that out of every nine marriages existing in the United States today seven will be dissolved by death and two will be disrupted by divorce. This means that one-fifth or twenty percent of our families are doomed and on the march to the Divorce Court. If men and women were told that twenty percent or one-fifth of the families in this country would be stricken with typhoid or smallpox or infantile paralysis they would then bring pressure upon their government to do its utmost to forestall the disaster. The personal disappointment and pain that precede and follow every divorce are entirely sufficient to awaken our concern; the social consequences are not less disturbing and distressing. It is not only advisable but urgent that we consider more carefully the conditions that menace marriage today and that impede the development of family organization. We know that many marriages fail because of lack of proper preparation; because of the absence of expert counsel and guidance; because of the weakness of the very foundations on which marriage and the family are built. But there are larger forces at work through which the family is crippled and marriage imperiled.

In the first place the family is passing through a critical period because of the fundamental changes that are taking place within the framework of the family itself. The crumbling of the old foundations, the power of the parent, the sacrament of religion, and even the contract of the State; and the laying of new foundations derived from the field of science, that is, biology, psychology and economics is a change of historical importance. The reduction in the size of the family and the conscious and deliberate limitation and spacing of children are also changes of great significance, as great perhaps as the change from polygamy to monogamy. The disintegration of the patriarchal form of organization and the emergence of the democratic type now taking shape is attended by adjustments even more difficult to make than the change from the matriarchal to the patriarchal period. The shifting in emphasis from the biological and the economic to the emotional and ethical function of the family is so profound as to mark a new stage in the role of family development. All these changes taking place in the function, the organization, the structure and the foundations of the family must inevitably lead to strain and conflict. These conflicts may seem to be on the surface nothing more than disagreements between individuals, between husband and wife or parent and child. In the light of the history of the family, however,

they take upon themselves the character of conflicts between old and new social concepts, old and new cultural attitudes and outlooks. This is what complicates and intensifies the problems and makes the family today not a center of personal quarrels and petty antagonisms but actually an arena of contending historical forces.

In the second place the family is in danger because traditional social constraints are relaxing and outgrown social pressures are dissolving. For generations the family as an institution was surrounded and sustained by a network of customs, conventions, standards and laws. This network is now rent at many points as a result of the eruptions of new social attitudes and programs. The emancipation of women, the acceptance of divorce as a solution of marital distress, the distrust of the double standard of morality, the growing cult of the pseudocelibate life for both men and women,—these and other social attitudes have ruptured and in large part destroyed the protecting network of the past. The family, however, has not yet developed that inward strength that is necessary when outward control is relaxed and removed. This strength can come only from experience, understanding and discipline. It is no wonder that many families stumble in their bewilderment, for many families like many individuals are able to maintain themselves in a normal state as long as they live in an environment that sustains them. But they disintegrate and collapse when this environment dissolves and disappears. It is easy to understand why families lose their sense of direction when we remember that not only does the family find itself reft of the protecting environment that the past provided but that it discovers itself uninstructed and unguarded in a world that is infinitely more complicated and difficult than the world of our parents and grandparents. The simple patterns of the past have been shattered and the family is utterly confounded in the presence of a social order that itself is in a state of cultural, economic and political confusion.

In the third place the family is threatened because of the impact and shock of current social changes and cataclysms. There is time at present to discuss only some of the conditions in the field of economic life. Studies have been made of the family and the depression but no one has been able to determine the extent of the damage that the family in the United States has suffered as the result of ten years of wide spread unemployment. Those who are in daily and immediate contact with families in distress do not find it difficult to visualize the demoralization that is taking place. Ten million men and women out of work whole time; four million families dependent upon public aid, local, state or federal; twenty-two and a half million men and women and children living in a state of destitution,—all this means the loss not only of wages and working skill but also the loss of confidence in self, interest in



life and hope in the future. It means a corroding spirit of discouragement, resentment and despair. Another economic condition that endangers the family is low income. The testimony presented not only to Congress but to the country by Dr. Isador Lubin, Commissioner of Labor Statistics, in December 1938, reveals that 87% of the families in the United States have an annual income of less than \$2500 and that 54% of the families have an income of less than \$1250. Sixteen million families are living on less than is necessary to maintain them on a decent and self-respecting level of life. Low income means a low standard of living; a low standard of living means low resistance; low resistance leaves the family open to a multitude of ills, not only physical but mental and moral. It would be sad enough if one-third of the nation were ill-fed, ill-clothed and ill-housed. It is doubly sad and doubly distressing to learn that 54% or sixteen million of the families in America are living below a normal level of life.

A further economic condition that corrupts family life is the evil of improper housing. Only those who visit families herded in tenement and slum districts realize the effect of these conditions on family life. The slums, we know from a number of studies, are breeding places of disease and delinquency and vice. They are not only a danger to health but they also are a menace to the moral life of the family and through the family the community. A home that lacks all proper conveniences, that has no proper furnishings, no proper beds and bedding, no table and not enough chairs, only a few broken dishes and rusty spoons, a home in which children walk about eating from their hands what little they can find and then drop to sleep in some unclean corner is not a place in which children and young people want to remain. A bleak and barren home drives young people into the street, the gangs and the gambling-den. More than this, overcrowding and congestion in tenements break down the barriers of privacy in family life and allow children and adolescents to see and hear things that seriously affect their moral development. In such a home it is impossible to develop even elementary family relationships, much less the graces that we naturally associate with the higher types of family development. A woman who studied housing conditions in New York and who also cherished a high regard for the home closed her report on housing with these words: "We as mothers ought to know that it is impossible to rear the right kind of a family in the wrong kind of a home." It is also impossible, we may add, to maintain a normal family on a subnormal income; or to expect the unemployed not to become in time the unemployable and destitute.

If the family is to cultivate its own creative powers, if it is to make its own peculiar contribution to the development of personality and to social progress the family must be freed from the conditions that now seriously hamper it in the economic field. Educational institutions, religious

organizations, and social welfare associations through education for marriage and family counselling can assist the family to adjust itself to the changes now taking place within the circle of the family, the changes in structure, organization, function and foundations. These agencies can aid the family to generate and to employ that inward strength that is necessary as outward pressures are relaxed and external supports are removed. This is to be expected in a democracy and with a democratically organized program. As this process develops tensions will decrease and conflicts diminish. Even now new habits, new attitudes, new standards are taking form. But neither the school nor the college, neither the church nor the synagogue, neither the social welfare agency nor the family counselor can save the family from the shock of cultural and political convulsions and the impact of unemployment, low income, poor housing, the evils of economic insecurity. The only agency strong enough to meet this situation is the Government itself. No other agency possesses the resources and the authority that are necessary to protect marriage and to conserve the family in this time of social crisis and tumult. The Federal Government in fact has made a beginning in the new program of the Social Security Act. Under the amendments passed during the last regular session of Congress covering old age insurance annuity rights, formerly limited to individually insured workers, were extended in part to wives and children of retired workers and to widows, orphans, and dependent parents of those deceased. The Chairman of the Social Security Board, Arthur J. Altmeyer, recently issued a statement in which he says: "Amendments by Congress during this past year substantially liberalized and extended the protection available under this program. Security for the family unit, rather than for the individual alone, became the major objective of the program, and more adequate benefit papers were provided." For the first time this great social program is interpreted in terms not of the individual but of the family.

Four years ago I ventured to recommend that a new Department be established within the State Government that would address itself to the problems of marriage and the family as the Departments of Health, Education, Social Welfare and Mental Hygiene now address themselves to the problems within their respective fields. We have reached the point where we are now able to take another and larger step. I, therefore, recommend that the Federal Government undertake to establish within the framework of the Federal system a Bureau or Division or Department that will be authorized to organize a national program for the protection of marriage and the conservation of the family. Thirty years ago the White House Conference on Children was held. Out of this Conference came the Children's Bureau in 1912. In these thirty years we have advanced far. In 1909 we believed that the child was the



center of social concern. Fifteen years later, however, we realized that little could be done with the child without the intelligent coöperation of the parent. Then began the movement of parent education in which the Children's Bureau has had a notable part. Today we can see clearly that it is not the child and not the parent, nor even both together, but the family that must be the focus of social thought and the unit of social treatment. We have, therefore, urged the White House Conference called by the President in April 1939 and that is to report its findings in January 1940 to recognize this advance in social thought and practice and to include within the scope of its program a section on The Family. We agree that the child needs better health facilities, better educational facilities and better vocational facilities; but what the child needs most of all is a better family into which to be born and a better home in which to develop. It is not too much, we are convinced, to hope that out of the present White House Conference a new Bureau will eventually come that will concern itself primarily with the family as the basic social order.<sup>1</sup>

Two plans suggest themselves as feasible and, we trust, acceptable. One plan would expand the present Children's Bureau into a Bureau on the Family. This would be a logical development of the Children's Bureau and in accordance with expanding interest and current social emphasis. The second plan would bring together all existing Bureaus in the Federal Government now concerned with the child, the parent and the home and coordinate them into a Department. There are several Bureaus that could be brought together in this manner, including the Children's Bureau, the Bureau of Women in Industry in the Department of Labor, the Bureau of Home Economics in the Department of Agriculture, the Division of Old Age Insurance in the Social Security Agency. This plan would be in accordance with the President's program to reorganize the Federal system and would consolidate into one organization all those agencies concerned with different elements and aspects of family life. Pending the adoption

<sup>1</sup> An Information Bulletin just received from the secretary of the White House Conference discloses that the Conference will consider eleven topics at the meetings to be held January 18th, 19th and 20th, 1940. Of the eleven topics four are concerned with the family: (1) The Family as the Threshold to Democracy; (2) Economic Resources of Families and Communities; (3) Housing the Family; (4) Economic Aid to Families.

and development of one or the other of these plans it would seem advisable to organize in an experimental way an Interdepartmental Committee composed of representatives of the different existing Bureaus. This Interdepartmental Committee, functioning under the supervision of one Department, could be charged with the responsibility and power to develop the Federal program on The Family and to prepare the plan for the new Department. An Interdepartmental Committee within the State Government<sup>2</sup> was first suggested by Homer Folks in 1936, and the same plan greatly enlarged would undoubtedly serve a similar purpose in the Federal Government. One function, perhaps the supreme function of this new Department, would be to emancipate the family from the thralldom of economic conditions and liberate the creative forces that are now struggling for expression within the circle of the family organization.

The family, we must remember, is something more than a legal entity or even a social institution. It is the cradle into which the future is born and the nursery in which the new democratic social order is being fashioned. The family is related to the past through tradition; but it is also related to the future through social responsibility and social trust. The family in this sense is a covenant with posterity. The highest function the family can perform today is to educate and train and discipline young men and women who themselves in time will constitute the new social state. It is the task of these young men and women through their own talents and acquired skills to increase the material resources, to enrich the intellectual treasures and to deepen the spiritual reservoirs upon which society must draw for nourishment and energy in both personal improvement and in social progress. In the changing dream of parenthood we have come to see that children are entrusted to our care not in order that they may serve us or worship at our grave; but in order that they may translate into realities the ideals toward which we, the elders, can merely grope through a blinding mist of agony and tears. If the family can be freed to perform this function it will become in ampler days and under a more gracious sky not only a dynamic but a beneficent factor in American society.

<sup>2</sup> This plan was recently recommended to Governor Lehman of New York by the New York State Conference on Marriage and the Family. See *Living*, Vol. I, November, 1939, p. 52.



# Types of Families—Communist, Fascist, Democratic

By CARLE C. ZIMMERMAN

Department of Sociology, Harvard University

THIS problem of family type in relation to the prevailing political scheme is a very old one. Plato's conception was for the abolition of the private family among the guardians or Schutzstaffel (Blackshirts) of his new state and its replacement by a semi-communist family in which certain selected females bore children at random to the guardians picked and trained partly for breeding purposes.<sup>1</sup> These children were to be raised in large collective nurseries such as have been discussed in Soviet Russia. His argument was that if people didn't know who their parents were, they would not love their family members to the exclusion of loyalty to the state.<sup>2</sup> Aristotle discussed this theory of Plato's and finally discarded it with the dry remark that if persons didn't love their family members they wouldn't love anyone—much less the contemporary state organizations.<sup>3</sup>

The problem was also under consideration some centuries earlier than Plato by Confucius in relation to the confused and demoralized political conditions then existing among the Chinese. Confucius solved the problem on the assumption that the family represented an important key relation between individuals, although it was only one of a number of such relations. In order to secure peace and harmony in general human relations, including the political, Confucius considered that the basic pattern of order and harmony had to be established first of all in the family itself.<sup>4</sup> He returned to filial piety as the pattern. According to him the one who was most competent in filial piety was also the best soldier, ruler, civil service official, and political subject.<sup>5</sup>

<sup>1</sup> The S.S. or Schutzstaffel are the black uniformed elite guards in the Nazi movement. Plato's guardians played a similar elite role in his theoretical Republic. For the position of the S.S. and the guardians compare *Mein Kampf* and the appropriate sections of the *Republic*.

<sup>2</sup> See the fifth book of Plato's *Republic* (H. Spens translation in the Everyman's Library) for this argument.

<sup>3</sup> See Aristotle's criticisms of Plato's scheme in Book II, Ch. III of his *Politics* (William Ellis' translation in Everyman's Library).

<sup>4</sup> Of the five or six important relations (husband-wife, parent-child, master-slave, young-old, friend and friend, and ruler-governed) Confucius considered those of husband and wife most important in the ordered state. The others depended upon this one. Of the numerous 3,000 rites in society, marriage rites were most important. (See *Chinese Proverbs*, Alan Scarborough, Shanghai, China, 1926.)

<sup>5</sup> Confucius held that there were three grades of filial piety: the highest ideal was to glorify one's parents by one's own effort and action; next, not to degrade their name; and lastly, to give them support and comfort. He held that it was "undutiful for a son to live irregularly, to serve his government unfaithfully, to conduct public duties dishonestly, to be unfaithful to his friends, or to be cowardly on the battlefields. Anyone of these five failures in life will bring disaster or dishonor to his parents."

The relation of family to political conceptions played an exceedingly prominent role in most other great political movements. One need only mention the emperor and military dictatorships in Rome, the Arabian philosophy developed at length in Mohammed's *Koran*, the changed philosophy of the Reformation writers with the development of the national state as opposed to the universal Christianity of the Middle Ages.<sup>6</sup>

These preliminary indications help one to see that attempted family reform has played a significant, perhaps the most significant, role in great social reform movements and in periods where culture has made great transformation. The reforms or attempted family changes of Plato came in the days of the orators and immediately preceded the decline of the great classic Grecian culture; the Confucian reform ideology came at a similar transitional period in Chinese culture. The Augustinian measures and the later reforms of the emperors came in the change from Republic to Empire in Rome and the decline of the Empire. Mohammed's reforms preceded the great flowering of the Arabic-Mohammedan culture. The "new" family conceptions of the Reformation writers, whether Martin Luther or Milton, preceded the so-called culture of "higher capitalism." Analyses of other cases, such as the rise of the feudal period, or the fluctuations of Hindu culture, show this clearly. Oswald Spengler, while often inaccurate in his minor historical details, certainly seems to have pointed this out correctly in his *Decline of the West*.

## *An Empirical Survey of Communist, Fascist, and Democratic Family Types*

When one turns to a question of the contemporary family under different types of political regimes one has to ask the following questions:

1. What countries may be considered as democratic, fascist, and communist?
2. Have these respective political regimes followed a consistent policy in regard to the family?
3. Have the results been in accordance with or contrary to the specific policies of the particular countries?

<sup>6</sup> See Tenney, Frank, *Aspects of Social Behavior in Ancient Rome*, Boston, 1932, Ch. I and IV. The five centuries of free marriage ended with Augustus. Mohammed's family conceptions are found chiefly in those sections of the *Koran* entitled "the Cow," "Women," and "Divorce." See Mansour Fahmy, *La Condition de la Femme dans la Tradition et l'Évolution de l'Islamisme*, Paris, 1913. For the Reformation writers see G. E. Howard's *History of Matrimonial Institutions*, Chicago, 1904, for the appropriate period.



4. Have the policies of these regimes had important differentiating influences? Can one separate a communist, fascist, or democratic family behavior from that arising from general or international traits, such as the depression from 1929 on, the general post-War depression, the Second World War, or the common traits in all industrialized society? Can the family as such be separated by political regimes in this age of "western culture" or "high capitalism?"
5. Is the family itself a purely nominal group responding to outside interest whether expressed by the individual or the state, or is the family a semi-real group with its own principles of operation and a certain amount of autonomy?

The man on the street has a conception that certain countries such as Russia are communist, others such as Germany, Italy, and Japan are fascist, and that the United States of America, Great Britain, and France are democratic. This may or may not be true. One now witnesses the union of Russia and Germany as opposed to France and England. A few years ago Russia was supposed to be included in a democratic group with England, France, and the United States which were supposed to be lined up against an anti-commintern pact of Germany, Italy, and Japan. Today the situation seems to have changed considerably. But if one agrees for purposes of argument that Russia is communist, Germany, Italy, and Japan are fascist, and England, France, and the United States are democratic, the situation becomes more difficult yet.

An illustration is a question of illegitimate births.<sup>7</sup> Illegitimacy probably increased in Russia in its early communist period, and is probably decreasing now. Among the alleged fascist countries illegitimate births dropped in Germany from 143,515 in 1927 to 98,394 in 1935. In Italy they climbed from 52,921 in 1927 to 54,695 in 1930 and dropped to 45,370 in 1935. In Japan, illegitimate births dropped from 143,987 in 1927 to 121,554 in 1934 and climbed to 125,170 in 1935. Among the alleged democratic countries the comparison of the situation is somewhat similar.

Illegitimate births increased in England from 1927-1930 and have since decreased. In France they have been decreasing most of the time even during the depression. In the U.S.A. they certainly increased both among the whites and the Negroes from 1927-1934 in spite of a decrease in the total number of births. Thus, this measure of the family type in the different political regimes does not enable us to differentiate between them. Russia, Italy, and England have had an increase followed by a decrease in the number of illegitimate births. Germany and France have had a decrease; whereas Japan and America had first a decrease followed by an increase or some form of irregular movement.

The same difficulty of differentiating among the political regimes as to family type is to be found if one uses

<sup>7</sup> See *Study on the Legal Position of the Illegitimate Child* and its bibliography. (League of Nations publication, 1939.)

other measures of the family such as the total births, the divorce phenomenon, or the relative legal status and social relations of the legitimate to the illegitimate child (and by cohesion of right of the relation of mistress to married wife). Births have been declining rapidly in all "democratic" countries but also in Italy, allegedly fascistic. The relations are the same in Germany and Russia, in both of which there was a tendency toward birth decline in the years of the twenties and an increase in the thirties. Japan has had slowly increasing births.

On the whole, divorces have been increasing in the democratic countries and decreasing in the fascist countries. In Russia they increased in the first days of communism and are now decreasing. The position of illegitimate children relative to legitimate also does not move according to type of political regime. In Russia, although no difference is made between illegitimates and legitimates, it seems clear that in the early days of communism, the relative position of the illegitimate improved, but after the first experiments the trend has been back toward the old Russian family type.<sup>8</sup> The law is still the same for the two but the tightened bonds between parent and child have probably made a great difference. In Germany and Italy there were also movements to improve the relative position of the illegitimates. But in each case as in France the movement has been nullified by opposing factors.<sup>9</sup> In Italy the Church opposed the movement, and in Germany the general tightening of family bonds and the higher value put upon "race," nationality, and ancestors by the new laws have had the same effect as the Church in Italy.<sup>10</sup> In France, on the other hand, the courts have begun to believe that any increase of the illegitimate status would be detrimental to the legitimate children.

In England and America, if anything, the relative status of the illegitimate has been improved by recent social service legislation.<sup>11</sup> The general tendency of old family law or organic family law is to disfavor the illegitimate; the general tendency of social service legislation is to consider the children equal under the law. Thus, the countries of "social service" legislation such as England and America have improved the status of the illegitimate relative to the legitimate. This applies equally to the mother of the illegitimates. In the above statements while the term "social service" is used for the type of legislation in England and America, it is recognized that the so-called fascist and communist countries have the same type of legislation under other names.

<sup>8</sup> See "Law and the Soviet Family," By John N. Hazard. *Wisconsin Law Review*, 1939.

<sup>9</sup> See Cherel, Albert, *La famille française*, Paris, 1924.

See Colin, André, *La famille dans la législation italienne*, Paris, 1931.

See Thabaut, Jules, *L'Evolution de la législation sur la famille (1804-1913)*, Paris and Toulouse, 1913.

<sup>10</sup> See Kirkpatrick, Clifford, *Nazi Germany: Its Women and Family Life*. Indianapolis, 1938.

<sup>11</sup> See *Study on the Legal Position of The Illegitimate Child*. League of Nations publication, 1939.



This brief summary of four measures of family types, namely, births, divorces, number of illegitimates, and the relative position of illegitimate to legitimate children, suggests that the political regimes have not in all cases followed a consistent policy in regard to the family. The most remarkable inconsistencies have been found in Russia, Germany, and Italy, although to some extent France and America have shown inconsistencies. Further, the results of the legislation have often been contrary to specific policies in particular countries. Thus, one sees the marked illustration in the case of Russia where the Marxian experiment in the pure "love" family finally ended in a movement back toward the old Russian family similar to that of the Czar's days. Then again, there is the blood and land policy in Germany in which the rich farmers got the land and the poor farmers and workers had most of the children.<sup>12</sup> Now it seems that the war economy certainly is using up the land produce.

It also appears that the policies of these regimes, while they may be differentiating influences concerning types of families, have not achieved results as important as their proponents originally thought. The Marxian family of Russia certainly never reached a picture of beautiful love companionship as that idealized earlier by Friedrich Engels and August Bebel.<sup>13</sup> The German family certainly never achieved the idyllic type which the Nazi romantics found discussed in the works of Caesar and Tacitus. The new Japanese family is not as wonderful as the Samurai family type pictured for early Japan, especially that found in virile periods of the Kamakuru and Tokogawa Shogunates.<sup>14</sup> Nevertheless, today the strength of the Japanese family with its Confucianist traditions is a marvel even to sophisticated western thinkers. The families in the alleged democratic countries also show remarkable strength in spite of the anti-familism of even our most respectable authorities on family law.<sup>15</sup>

One is more or less forced to the conclusion that international influences such as the depression, the Second World War, and the other general common traits of "western culture" and "high capitalism" have tended to go beyond the political regimes to some extent and to affect all western families alike. Furthermore, the remarkable resistance of the family in the so-called democratic countries to the anti-family influences present in these regimes suggests that the family as an organism tends to

have a certain autonomy of its own. In other words, the exaggerated nominalist conception of the family held by American and other sociologists seems no longer tenable. The use of the words "domestic relations" in place of family law, or the conception of the family as "a unity of interacting personalities" do not differentiate the family from any other social organization by the use of such words. The writers assume that the family has no intrinsic reality but is merely an agent. Our so-called family texts are really treatises on individual sociology when the individual is under the influence of the family rather than treatises on the family.

One is driven to the conclusion that there is a family unit which is a more or less permanent or enduring *social fact* in contradistinction to *individual fact*. The family is not the average or sum of its members, but something different in itself. Further proofs of this are the resistance of the family to the multitude of restrictions also arising in the totalitarian regimes. In spite of excuses, "reinterpretations," and communist and fascist ideologies, the outstanding fact is that the family here as in the democratic countries has apparently shown a "social mind" of its own. The wear and tear of social life in the twentieth century will in itself probably preclude any further development of family nominalism. Men psychologically devitalized by the storms of this century of wars will want a family different from the non-family regime of life.

#### *Theoretical Analysis of Communist, Fascist, and Democratic Types of Families*

The general political struggle of these two World Wars and the revolutionary demoralism accompanying them has produced a great many propagandistic, Utopian, and "indirect experience" conceptions concerning the relation between political regime and family type. One conception is that the democratic regime has a democratic family type which is midway between the authoritarianism of the fascist groups, on the one hand, and the complete Utopian freedom of the Marxian family on the other. The assumption back of this theory is that perfect freedom exists in the communist family and perfect tyranny exists in the fascist family. In between is a democratic family with its mixture of authoritarianism and complete freedom.

America has been deluged by quack family doctors who recommend such fantastic things as that you must not speak reprovingly to your own children because such is the act of a tyrant and merely makes a fascist out of your child. The good citizen has been told that if he must stray from the normal everyday family behavior customary of the old American type that the most favored direction is toward mildness and freedom. Then, if the child does not become a good democratic citizen, he will at least become a good communist. According to this

<sup>12</sup> See Zimmerman, Carle C., "Soil and Men—Blut und Boden," *Land Policy Review*, July–August, 1939.

<sup>13</sup> See Engels, Friedrich, *The Origin of the Family*, Chicago, 1902.

See Bebel, A., *Women in the Past, Present, and Future*, 4th Ed., London, 1902.

<sup>14</sup> See Embree, John F., *Suye Mura* (University of Chicago Press, 1939), Chs. III & VI.

<sup>15</sup> See Vernier, Chester G., *American Family Laws* (Stanford University Press, 1936).

See particularly his critical comments on needed revisions of our laws.

See my analysis in *Rural Sociology*, September, 1937, pp. 354–355.



spurious sociology, communism is nothing more than exaggerated democracy. (This might well be true if one accepts only the Aristotelian conception of anarchy as the final end of democracy and then calls anarchy "democracy".) Really communism seems to end (also as Aristotle implied) in a military dictatorship over an exhausted people.

In spite of the popularity of this foregoing doctrine concerning the communist family, a scientific examination of all the facts inevitably leads one to classify it as a great delusion. It is clear that the Marxian conception of the family tried out not only in our own Utopian communities but in Russia on a grand scale has finally ended in disaster. No matter what explanation may be given for the new family law adopted after 1926 in Russia, the fact is that it is the old nationalist Russian household covered up by a thin coat of new pink paint.

In a somewhat similar respect one has been told to believe that the fascist families, whether in Italy, Germany, or Japan, are a return to an ancient "racial" type. The Italian is said to return to a Roman *Patria Potestas*, but *Patria Potestas* varied very much in Roman history. The German and Japanese families are said to go back to the old German tribal law, and to the family code of the Samurai. These ideas also must be classed as some of the great erroneous conceptions of the twentieth century. The Italian, the German, and the Japanese families are apparently not more antiquated than their previous families of 1910. In each country the governments or the people are trying to hold up their birth rates and some workable family integrity in the face of the demoralization, the wars, the demands of the military economies, and the mistakes and difficulties of their prevailing dictatorships. Unconsciously, it seems the past and possible future losses of human blood and culture in this present century of a new one hundred years war has driven people to try to use the family to save something out of the maelstrom of conflict. All these fascist countries seem to be saying to themselves, more or less unconsciously, that "If we can hold our present pre-war families together in this deluge, then they or their children can rebuild the cultures which we and our overlords and enemies are destroying in this race for world domination."

But the grand family delusions are not all to be found in the fascist and communist countries. The alleged democratic countries are involved in this matter also. Probably no country has suffered a greater actual and potential loss in familism since 1920 than America. Between 1920 and 1935 the estimated births per 1,000 women, 15 to 44, has dropped from 114 to 73 yearly.<sup>16</sup> Even the fertility

<sup>16</sup> See Stouffer, Samuel and Lazarsfeld, Paul, *Research Memorandum on the Family in the Depression* (Social Science Research Council publication, 1937). P. 123 et passim.

rate of 115 per thousand women, 15 to 44, per year was hardly enough for America of this century considering our natural resources, our artificial nitrogen supply, our ingenuity, and the possible dangers of war losses. If America had kept the 1920 birth rate until 1940, there would probably be twelve to fifteen million more people of American birth residing in the United States. This alone would have solved most of our agricultural surplus problems. One need not mention the advantages such an increase would have for stimulating our heavy industries. Then there is the peculiar American psychological problem that we have never had a native-born proletariat. Such a growth would give a greater opportunity for an enlarged and disciplined upper class that then would have more to do than now. This might have helped our middle classes in their struggle with the proletariat on the one hand, and our degenerate elite, on the other.

However, America went ahead on the grand illusion that one can vote for freedom instead of working for it and discipline character without familism so it too has turned to the conscious wasting of human resources on a broad scale. America must still undergo the shocks of a hesitating and even declining population in the next twenty years in addition to the economic blows of the past twenty years. Nevertheless, having done nothing but make the situation worse, we are still hoping with a false optimism that America can pass safely through this present worldwide demoralization.

What has been said about America's great illusions applies with equal force to France and England. It is often said that communism is an export doctrine and fascism is not. I think the reverse is more likely to be true. Communism is apparently a disease in the body politic. The convalescent stage is an incipient and weakened nationalism or Leviathanism. Fascism by its excess nationalism forces fascism into other countries. That is almost as inevitable as the spread of a storm over a worldwide sea. What part of fascism is not yet to be found in temporary America will soon be here unless we build up the bulwarks of a strong familistic democracy.

This paper began with an analysis of family types in different political regimes. It ends with considerations on political-social policy regarding the family, particularly the weakened non-reproducing and non-functioning American family. The analysis will probably shock many still hypnotized by some of our current anarchial illusions. On the other hand, it does suggest that America has yet to consider the fundamental problem of her future family type. The family is essentially and intrinsically a human thing. Let us worry about the family. The humanness, which many now consider a first goal, will follow.



# The Family as Cultural Agent

By LAWRENCE K. FRANK

New York City

THE family has become the focus of interest and study to an increasing variety of specialists and of others concerned with social welfare. There is however, relatively little recognition of the role of the family as the primary cultural agent. This paper is offered in the hope of directing attention to that aspect of the family.

Because of the usual obscurity and perplexity in verbal definitions, it is suggested that we approach this topic somewhat obliquely and seek a wider perspective for our discussion. One such approach is to examine what culture does to and for human life.

It is obvious that as organisms we exist in geographical space or what we call nature, subject to gravitation, heat, cold, physical, and chemical and biological events, to which we are continually reacting in innumerable responses and readjustments about which we may have little or no awareness. Unlike all other species that have adapted to nature through organic differentiation and specialization, man has rejected a purely biological existence, on the level of organic functioning and impulse, and attempted to live in terms of ideas and tools. All over the world, therefore, we find groups of people existing in this same geographical space or nature upon which, however, they have imposed their favored ideas, beliefs, meanings, and significances and their techniques and tools. Each group of people has constructed a cultural world, like a screen, which they have interposed between themselves and the geographical environment of nature, so that they only see, hear, feel, are aware of, and believe that which their cultural world permits or requires of them.

Thus we find that different peoples conceive of the world as having been created in wholly different ways, and as being operated or controlled by wholly different powers, authorities, forces, or processes. The ongoing processes of natural events, the wide diversity of structures and organisms, indeed the whole cosmos, are viewed in the framework of the ideas and beliefs cherished by each group as the only true and valid interpretation.

In addition to this screen they impose upon nature, each group also has developed patterns of conduct, of what they may and must do and what they are forbidden to do, in the many and varied activities of living and human functioning.

What is of great significance is that nothing in nature makes these cultural formulations and beliefs necessary or

inevitable. The ongoing natural processes and events submit, as it were, to these extraordinarily diverse patterns and formulations many of which appear to be self-contradictory and often in conflict with the structures and events to which they pertain. Moreover, nothing in nature or in biological processes makes necessary or inevitable the peculiar patterns of conduct, of prohibitions and compulsions, which different groups impose upon their own behavior. Indeed the most amazing variety of patterns of conduct may be found in different cultures, each of which sanctions certain conduct and prohibits other conduct according to its own formulations.

If we try to find some order and meaning in this great diversity and complexity of cultures, we can gain some insight by recognizing that each culture may be viewed as a response to the persistent life tasks that face all peoples. First, in order to exist and perpetuate their kind, people must come to terms with the environment, work out some patterns of dealing with a precarious and problematic world for sustenance, and protection, and survival as organisms. Second, in order to live as a group they must organize the group life so that individual members will carry on their life activities within a framework of accepted patterns of conduct, meanings, and sanctions that will give the group life some order, regularity, and uniformity. Third, the behavior of each individual must be patterned to fit within this group life by building within the individual the prohibitions and compulsions, the ideas and beliefs, and the feelings that guide relationship between individuals and foster conformity to the group life.

Thus, in response to these persistent life tasks, each culture has developed a way of ordering events, organizing experience, and regulating conduct. To do so each culture has created a number of basic organizing concepts and beliefs to define situations and to give its preferred meanings and significance to life. These basic concepts may be described briefly as follows:

A conception of the universe, how it was created or evolved, what power or authority or control governs its operations, and how events are directed and related.

A conception of man's place in that universe, how he originated and is related to the cosmos; whether a part of nature or outside nature, and how related to the natural events and processes.

A conception of the individual's place in, and relation to, the group life or society of which he is a member, as expressed in caste, class, rank, sovereignty,



social, political, and economic rights and duties, etc.

A conception of human nature and conduct and beliefs about motivation, the self, and the sanctions for conduct.

These four conceptions are interdependent in that they reinforce and complement and provide sanctions for each other. They guide the individual to meet the major problems of ordering events, participating in the group life and regulating his own conduct and they provide the basis for the institutional life of the group. Here we must pause to recall that socialized conduct, as for example, what we call private property and the sanctity of the person are not natural biological events, but rather the learned patterns of conduct, of respecting the inviolability of things and persons, to approach which the institutional pattern of contract, barter, buying and selling, courtship and marriage, employment, and the like, are provided.

It would require much more time than is now available to discuss the many different aspects and phases of this cultural approach. It must suffice here to point out that what we call culture and the social life to which it gives rise are not fixed, unchanging cosmic processes, that operate like physical, chemical, and biological events, but rather are the historically developed patterns of belief, action, speech, and feelings that guide and direct human conduct. They are human creations, expressing the beliefs, the selective awareness, and the esthetic preferences and sensibilities of each cultural group—what might be called their design for living. Moreover, it is evident that the continuity of culture and of the social life depends upon the inculcation into each generation of children of these basic conceptions and beliefs, patterns of conduct, and of feeling.

The significance of the foregoing statements must be sought by contrasting this viewpoint with the traditional beliefs about culture as something super-organic and superhuman, operating in and through mysterious processes beyond human reach. Also it should be contrasted with the widely accepted belief that social life is a super-organic, superhuman organization or system, a part of the cosmic processes, operating through large scale social forces, like gravitation, to which man must obediently submit. In contrast to those beliefs is the growing realization that culture is not out there, somewhere between earth and sky, but is in us, in our selective awareness, our patterned conduct, and our ideas and beliefs about nature and man and human life. Culture exists in each of us, because it has been built into our growing organisms in infancy and childhood and youth when we were taught to believe, to see, to act, and to *feel* as required of members of our culture. Likewise, what we call organized society is in us, in the patterned conduct, speech, belief, and sensibilities which direct our lives in and through the

group-sanctioned institutional practices of contract, sale, marriage, voting, etc. All the immense array of symbols and rituals, of tools and techniques, of records and agreements and formulas, derive their significance and their potentialities from the conduct of individuals who have been taught to recognize their meanings, to utilize their potencies and apply them to the business of living.

By this devious path we come then to the family as the primary cultural agent, recognizing then that each individual child must be inducted into our culture and must be socialized if culture and social life are to continue. The child must learn to relinquish his naive biological behavior and physiological functioning and accept the socially sanctioned conduct and physiological requirements of the group.<sup>1</sup> The regularization of hunger and its transformation into appetite for the specific foods our group prefers, at the prescribed intervals; the surrender of physiological autonomy of eliminations and acceptance of group prescribed practices; the regularization and patterned expression of emotional reactions, all these must be taught to the infant. Then he must be further socialized by learning to observe the inviolabilities of things and persons, which require him to tolerate exposure to biologically adequate stimuli without responding. Even the characteristic roles of masculine and feminine conduct must be learned as the required patterns for boys and girls, youths and maidens. Along with these lessons in conduct, is given the basic orientation in the conceptual picture of our culture, in answer to the childish questions, of who made the world, who made man, how and why did this or that occur and what makes people do this and that. The growing child is also instructed in the use of and response to language, symbols, the institutional practices of money and credit, of voting and litigation, and so on and so on.

The pictures of the world, of man, of social life, and of human nature, and the innumerable socially sanctioned practises of our group life are transmitted to the child by the family, guided usually in this by the church and the school. But in rearing the child and teaching these many and difficult lessons, each family presents its version or interpretation of the official culture, placing different emphasis and using different sanctions and explanations, often stressing some portions and neglecting others. Moreover, each family, being composed of individual personalities, each with peculiar emotional bias and feeling toward the world and toward each child, also gives this teaching an affective meaning, or emotional significance, that makes these lessons even more distinctive for each child. In addition it must be recognized that this special family version of culture and of the social patterns is presented to a child who will learn from this family

<sup>1</sup> Cf. the writer's paper. *The Fundamental Needs of the Child. Mental Hygiene*, Vol. XXII, No. 3, July 1938, pp. 353-379.



tuition only what it means to him individually, especially as he *feels* toward the parents and their teachings.

Thus we face a situation which is indeed amazing: as organisms we exist in the natural world of geographical space; as members of our society, we live in the cultural world we have been taught to recognize and accept as essential to participation in that life, but, as individual personalities, we live in a private world of the idiomatic meanings, significances, ideas, and beliefs, and above all, of the feelings and emotional reactions which each of us has developed toward people and situations. Just as the social and cultural world is organized according to the traditional patterns imposed upon each new generation by its predecessors, so the private world of each personality is organized by each individual out of the experiences of being acculturated and socialized by the family.

What we call the personality, then, may be viewed, not as a thing or collection of discrete traits, capacities, etc., but as the dynamic process of organizing experience and reacting affectively to life, whereby each individual builds up and strives to maintain his private world.<sup>2</sup> Whatever an individual does or says then must be viewed in terms of its meaning and significance for his private world and his peculiar personal feelings. This does not imply any subjective bias or powers, but rather it is a recognition in the field of human affairs of what we are discovering about all other forms of life. It finds support in the realization that upon this same earth an amazing variety of organic life has developed, so that each genus and each species lives in a special world, selected from the total environment by its peculiar structural-functional-behavioral capacities and needs. Through ideas and tools and feelings man has created his many varieties of human society and as an individual, he creates his own private world by his selective awareness and feelings.

What gives this conception of the family as the primary cultural agent special significance is that it provides a new and promising approach to our perplexing and baffling social problems and indicates where and how our aspirations toward human values may be more effectively pursued. We are beginning to realize that every culture gives rise to a character structure and fosters personalities, the bearers of which are the active agents of that society. Whatever, therefore, we find as the dominant interest, drives, and occupation of the members of the society may be looked upon as an expression of the character structure of that culture. Again, whatever personality expressions we find in the society, the way in which people conduct their personal lives and human relations, their persistent feelings, their emotions toward others, may also be regarded as an outcome of what the culture has done to

those individuals in fostering those personalities and those ways of life.

Thus, if we find certain individuals whom we can unreservedly admire and approve as socially valuable and humanly desirable, we may see them as the outcome of a family life which not only inducted them into culture and prepared them for social life, but did so in such a way as to foster a sane, integrated, cooperative and friendly personality. On the other hand, if we see unhappy, distorted, anti-social, individuals, engaged in activities that we call delinquency, crime, sex offenses, and the innumerable other forms of sabotage, defeat, and exploitation seen in business, politics, and professional work, they too may be viewed as the products of family life and of methods of child rearing and socialization that have given them the kind of personalities who are driven by their own inner emotional conflicts and unhappiness to engage in these activities regardless of the destruction and of the defeat they are inflicting on others.

This conception of the family as cultural agent which transmits the culture to the child, attempts to socialize him and in doing so fosters a personality and a private world, enables us to understand that whatever individuals do are symptoms of their feelings toward life, derived from their early experience as children, when they were undergoing this family training and socialization. Thus we can interpret their conduct, especially their anti-social, destructive activities, as the outward, overt expressions of their own inner insecurity, unhappiness, anxiety, and the distortions and frustrations they have suffered. Even very successful individuals, who aggressively and often ruthlessly strive for position, power, and prestige, at an incalculable cost to society and to the many who must be sacrificed for such success, these also may be viewed as personalities who are driven by resentment, hostility, anxiety, and guilt, to wreak themselves on life generally, seeking release from these feelings that incessantly goad them to such careers.

Instead, then, of the fatalistic belief that human nature is fixed and unchangeable, and that social life is a super-human organization, operating by cosmic forces above and beyond man's control, we may find in this viewpoint the basis for a new hope and renewed faith. If we adopt this newer conception of human nature as essentially plastic, capable of being directed and patterned into the configurations and expressions that are favored and sanctioned by our culture, and if we recognize that culture itself is man's own efforts to order events and regulate human affairs, to give meaning and purpose to life, then indeed we are faced with a new prospect. We may boldly assert that culture can be reorganized and redirected because it is just this patterning of human nature and conduct in accordance with the ideas and beliefs and the sensibilities provided by our cultural traditions. Today,

<sup>2</sup> Cf. the writer's paper, *Projective Methods for the Study of Personality*. *Journal of Psychology*, 1939, 8, 389-413.



as a result of the accumulated study and questionings we call scientific investigation, we are, very hesitatingly and timidly, beginning to scrutinize our traditional culture and our society, as we have all other areas of nature. Just as we have learned in astronomy and physics and chemistry, and more recently in biology, to look behind tradition and authority and ask whether the ideas and beliefs in those areas are valid in the light of a critical examination of their meanings and their consequences, so in the areas of social and cultural life and of individual conduct we are beginning to question the traditional ideas, beliefs, and theories, even though they come to us supported by ancient and venerable authority. What we are asking is not the authority and sanction for these beliefs and practices but what are their consequences for human life, both individually and socially?

As we reflect upon the amazing change that has come over Western European culture through the critical examination and investigations that we call modern science, it is not unwarranted to expect that the critical examination of our society and our culture will lead to far-reaching modifications and changes which we today can scarcely imagine. It must be recognized, however, that if we examine our traditional ideas and beliefs and find them no longer valid or credible in the light of our newer knowledge and insights, and if, in addition, we find that they are productive of the social disorder and of personality distortions that constitute our major social problems, then we must courageously undertake to create the new concepts, the new patterns, and the new sanctions to meet the persistent tasks of life.

This brings us directly to the operation of the family as cultural agent because what the family teaches the child and the way in which it attempts to socialize the child is already being shown as in need of change. Most of the ideas and beliefs that are taught to the children with respect to these basic organizing concepts of life are obsolete and no longer credible except to those who have dedicated their lives to the perpetuation of the archaic and the anachronistic. The basic ideas and beliefs taught to children about the nature of the universe, about man's place therein, about the relation of man to his fellows and his group, and about human nature and conduct, are untenable by every criteria of modern science. Moreover, the traditional methods of child rearing, employed by the family and sanctioned by authority, deliberately terrorize, brutalize, and humiliate the child and produce those per-

sistent feelings of anxiety and guilt and lifelong resentment and hostility which every competent student finds operating in the lives of the unhappy, anti-social individuals of today. This point must be emphasized because it is becoming evident that many ideas and procedures which are urged upon parents for moral and ethical training and for guidance in sex life are themselves responsible for so many of the tragedies among adolescents and young adults. Thus we are beginning to realize that the very family life that enjoys the highest social approval for its conformity to these traditional practices and beliefs, may, ironically enough, be responsible for the misconduct and disastrous lives of the children and youth who have been subject to that kind of child rearing.

The task we face then is to examine critically the cultural traditions now guiding families in rearing children, to evaluate those traditions, especially the ethical and moral instruction, in terms, not of their historical authority and sanctions, but in terms of the social life and the personalities they produce.

This task is not simple nor easily to be undertaken. It will involve critical scrutiny of many of the most cherished ideas and beliefs in our traditions, and the courage to ignore some of the most powerful sanctions in our culture that demand conformity to these obsolescent ideas and beliefs and destructive practices. If we do undertake this task which now appears as the major challenge of our time, then we may find needed courage and strength and faith, in the realization that we are accepting the full consequences of the democratic aspiration toward recognition and conservation of the integrity of the individual.

So long as human personalities are being warped, distorted, humiliated, and degraded by these ideas, beliefs, and practices, they are the major obstacles to achievement of a democratic society. If we recognize that democracy depends upon how children are nurtured and socialized by the family, then, perhaps, we can give parents renewed confidence and faith in the supreme importance of the family life for our culture and our society. The need is for clarification of the unlimited opportunities in family life for creation of a better culture,<sup>3</sup> by fostering sane, integrated personalities who will not be compelled to defeat and destroy others or themselves because of their childhood experiences and teachings.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. the writer's paper. Facing Reality in Family Life. *Mental Hygiene*, Vol. XXI, No. 2, April 1937, pp. 224-230.



# The Family, the Law and the State

By MAX RHEINSTEIN

*University of Chicago Law School*

STATE and family are apparently two opposite spheres of life; while the state is concerned with the noisy realm of politics and government, the family, at least ideally, is the sphere of privacy, a haven of quiet in a tumultuous world. Yet state and family have both to fulfill similar tasks. Both are units of social organization, the family the smallest, the state the largest. The state cannot fulfill its tasks without the existence of healthy families wherein the young members of society are born, reared and educated, where care is taken of the old and the sick, where the individual finds a much needed psychological retreat, and the opportunity for the satisfaction of his sexual desires. Since the state cannot properly function without a proper fulfillment of these tasks by the family, the state must necessarily supervise and, to a certain extent, regulate the family.

Meetings of organizations, which, as for instance the National Conference on Family Relations, are composed of sociologists, social workers, psychologists, physicians, and other people who are not members of the legal profession, seem to be interested primarily in such legal problems as marriage and divorce, especially the latter, and, occasionally, in the problems of the illegitimate child. These fields present the problems of greatest human interest. The lawyers, however, are concerned also with numerous problems relating to as dull a matter as money. The property aspects of the family law appear important to the structure of the family and their analysis may reveal a great deal about the attitude which a given state takes toward the family in general. The following discussion will be largely concerned with these property problems. They will be discussed with a view to finding out to what extent present American law regards the family as a social unit, and to what extent it disregards the family and deals with its members as isolated individuals.

The position taken in these respects by present American law will become clearer when we contrast our modern law with an order of society in which the individual is disregarded and in which the only unit with which the law is concerned is the family. Such a state of affairs existed in ancient Rome, where legal rights and duties existed only for the heads of families, who represented their members in every respect. Property could be owned by no one but a head of a family. Whatever was earned by a member of a family automatically became the property of the family chief. He alone was responsible for the performance of any contract concluded, or for any

tort committed, by any member of the family. English law, down to the seventeenth century, recognized the individuality of the child, who could hold property of his own, who could make a contract, and who was responsible for his torts. English common law did not, however, recognize the separate personality of a married woman. Her personality was merged with that of her husband.

Modern Married Women's Acts have changed this situation and have emancipated married women in every respect. The question must be asked, however, whether this trend has not gone too far and whether it has not endangered the interests of such outsiders with whom members of the family come to deal. The law may establish the separate personality of a married woman or of children living in the homes of their parents. It should not disregard, however, the fact that in a majority of cases the husband and father is the provider of the family, that all the members of the family are dependent upon his resources, and that people who are compelled to deal with a married woman or a child are frequently confronted with a financially irresponsible debtor. This situation is particularly dangerous for the victims of torts committed by members of a family. The dangers of this situation have attracted attention since the arrival of the automobile and various devices have been developed to reach the assets of the husband and father for the benefit of a person who has been injured by a wife or a child negligently driving the family car.

Contract debtors can be detrimentally affected by the existing possibilities of juggling assets between husband and wife or from a father to his children, and it appears that the existing protective devices are not always sufficient. Furthermore, it has become necessary to develop remedies against a husband or a father for the benefit of businessmen who have sold goods or have rendered services from which the family benefits as a whole.

The English law with its theoretically complete disregard of the fact that the family still represents an economic unit has not been followed in a small number of states in the South and the far West of the United States, where the so-called system of community property has been adopted. Under this system husband and wife are treated as standing to each other in a relation of partnership in which all gains made by either partner constitute a common fund, and where this common fund is liable

*(Continued on page 36)*



# Biological Basis of the Family

By CARL G. HARTMAN

THIS paper will be confined to a factual presentation of those results of recent researches in sexual physiology which are likely to seem significant to the members of the National Conference on Family Relations. The application of the data I must leave to the social philosopher on the one hand and to the practical social worker on the other. The essential facts concerning the relations of man and woman, both as sex partners and as actual and potential parents, may be summed up under the heading Physiology of Reproduction. Here must be included also behavioral relations. Dr. Robert M. Yerkes has stated the matter as follows: "I think of the whole business [of behavior] as physiology and hope for the wise and steady extension of that science to include all forms and aspects of behavior."

Since the turn of the century the physiology of reproduction has been one of the chief growth regions of medical science; neurology has become another and these two are joining their forces in the elucidation of sexual problems. It is true that problems are often attacked piecemeal, attention being focused on special glands or other organs; I shall try, however, to preserve the behaviorist's viewpoint which also considers the total function of the organism or person. In this way only may the results of specific studies be made to contribute to a solution of problems in social behavior.

The principal facts that I wish to bring before you center about the menstrual cycle of the woman and it is around this rhythmic phenomenon and its control that I shall organize my presentation. There is a biology of the human male also; but the exigencies of time forbid its discussion here, suffice it to say that some of the principles of endocrine control of reproductive processes in the female hold for the male also.

Since the female cycle is directly under the control of the ovaries, the rhythmic changes in these organs must engage our attention first.

With the passing of a menstrual period growth processes in the ovary result in the progressive development of a structure which envelops and nourishes the egg and provides a mechanism for its expulsion into the egg tube where it may or may not be fertilized.

The structure harboring the egg in the ovary is known as a follicle which, when mature, attains in the human ovary the size of a small hazelnut through the accumulation of a clear colorless fluid. Other signs of maturity appear in the follicle which then ruptures, the fluid escaping and carrying with it the ovum. This is the act of ovulation.

The history of the ovarian follicle does not end here, however, for out of the cells which nursed the egg arises a new organ, the corpus luteum. The former nurse cells swell to thirtyfold size and each receives a complement of blood capillaries. There is thus formed a new gland of internal secretion whose products are taken up directly by the blood for the benefit of other organs.

The ovarian follicle, therefore, not only provides the egg, the *sine qua non* of reproduction, but it also constitutes a double-acting gland, producing two different hormones. Until the collapse of the thin-walled follicle at ovulation, the cells secrete the female sex hormone *estrin*; after reconstitution of the structure into the corpus luteum the cells secrete the corpus luteum hormone *progesterin*. These hormones collaborate in their action on various organs (vagina, uterus, breast) as well as on the body as a whole. They affect the entire organism, causing profound changes of mood and mental attitude, including the rise and decline of sex tension. If the hormones are secreted in normal amount and balance, they are responsible for a general feeling of well being.

Of especial interest are the changes in the uterus caused by the ovarian hormones. These changes are in the nature of the preparation of the uterus for the reception of the fertilized egg—the nurse cells of the egg, through chemical messengers, provide for the further protection and nutrition of the egg. Until ovulation the estrin of the growing follicle causes growth and swelling of the tissues, after ovulation the progesterin of the corpus luteum continues the changes making for a soft, moist, well vascularized nesting place for the new individual. In the event, however, that the egg fails to be fertilized, the corpus luteum ceases its secretion and the whole structure of the uterine lining collapses, tissues slough off and the menstrual bleeding occurs.

Such is the sequence of events in the normal cycle under the influence of an active ovary. The events can, however, be exactly duplicated artificially in women whose ovaries have had to be removed. This can be done with natural extracts of the ovaries but in this good year, 1940, synthetic chemistry produces the hormones in quantity out of commoner, even vegetable compounds. We have in our hands even now more material for substitution therapy in this field than we know how safely to administer.

While it is broadly speaking true, as stated, that the cyclic changes in a woman are largely and directly under the ægis of the ovaries, these organs are not the prime movers of the cycle, that is, the stimuli to action do not



rise spontaneously in these organs. It has been known for over a decade that the ovaries (and in the male the testes) are under the control of that most versatile of our glands, the anterior pituitary gland situated at the base of the brain. The relation is mutual, i.e., the ovaries have a regulating function, through their hormones, with reference to the pituitary, keeping this in periodic check by "stop and go" exchange of stimuli.

This mutual relationship between sex glands and pituitary illustrates the internal regulation of the total function of the person. We have already mentioned three links in the chain: pituitary→ovary→uterus. This is only a beginning, for the entire body participates in all of the changes of the "internal milieu." This is true not only in a chemical sense, for there are many examples of action of nerve impulses in influencing the secretion.

The connection between nerve stimuli and pituitary has been demonstrated by recent researches. Let us illustrate with a striking series of experiments in the rabbit.

It has been known for a long time that the rabbit will not ovulate without mating. When mated, ovulation occurs 10 hours later. When it was proved that ovulation was brought about by hormones from the pituitary the question arose: how do the nerve impulses from the act of mating reach the pituitary? First, if the pituitary stalk with its nerve fibers from the brain is severed, copulation occurs readily but never ovulation. However, if one sever the spinal cord thus cutting off sensory fibers from the sex organs; if in addition one remove the sympathetic chains and also destroy sight, smell, and hearing, and even remove the cerebrum, leaving however the pituitary stalk intact—such a mutilated rabbit doe, actively stimulated by a male, will nevertheless ovulate because of stimuli coming from the anterior part of the body through the hypothalamus of the brain to the pituitary. The formula: pituitary↔ovary must now read ovary→pituitary→hypothalamus. In the male a similar relation obtains, for it has been shown that pituitary hormones are necessary for a steady output of millions of spermatozoa per day and also of those sex hormones which maintain the male characteristics.

From the well established physiological principles just stated certain implications emerge which should interest us on this occasion. One relates to the control of sterility by means of pituitary hormones, the other to the control of reproductive functions through the neural pathway as for example by the control of mental states.

Sterility ranks as one of the greatest problems of medicine and sociology. Thousands of childless couples everywhere are seeking medical aid in their warm desire for the completion of the family. So far little aid has been forthcoming, for the causes of sterility are various and often highly complicated. In a third of the sterile couples the fault lies with the male. Improvement of the general

health, as for example through dietary regimens, has now and again proved helpful. Our study of the hormonal and neural control of sex functions suggests two other possibilities: 1) improvement of mental attitude and 2) administration of stimulating hormones of the pituitary.

The mental state, it has long been known, greatly influences reproductive processes. Young girls off at college and away from home for the first time are apt to experience a period of amenorrhea. A nursing mother may cease lactating because of fright—these phenomena are to be interpreted as effects of nerve stimuli acting on the pituitary via the hypothalamus. On the other hand, women long sterile have been known to conceive on a pleasant vacation. The contentment a woman experiences as a consequence of adopting a child, so it is reported in the literature, sometimes results in such self-regulation of the endocrines that ovulation is brought about and conception made possible. The psychiatrist has a distinct field here; or we may put it this way, the gynecologist may well practice both psychiatry and endocrine therapy.

While efforts toward the establishment of self-regulation of the sex endocrine glands constitute the ideal, it is quite likely that pituitary hormones may successfully be employed to stimulate the growth and rupture of ovarian follicles in the sterile wife or in the husband to stimulate the production of normal spermatozoa. Both of these have probably already been achieved in borderline cases clinically, as I have achieved a modicum of success in sterile monkey females which could probably not have ovulated spontaneously. Much needs to be learned, however, as to diagnosis of each case and the type and dosage of the hormones to be administered. Control cases should also be studied, i.e., those who receive hypodermic injections of sterile saline or who hear the buzz of a non-radiating X-ray machine in impressive surroundings. With due regard for caution and conservatism, however, it is my belief that the results of researches in this field already inspire optimism with respect to the alleviation of sterility in many families.

The cyclic ebb and flow of the sex hormones in women as thus far detailed leaves its impress in the woman's changing moods. The dominant sex that rules the world and makes and executes our laws, the physician or the social worker who gives advice, the husband who observes at first hand—all should recognize the fact that the woman's feelings are at the mercy of her hormones. She must cope with them as she may but she cannot escape their effect. We are interested at this time particularly in what investigators have taught us concerning mental influences of the hormones both as to the normal wave of sexual responsiveness and as to certain pathological expressions of excess or deficient hormones.

That women experience a rhythm of sex desire seems



axiomatic; yet extensive studies on this point are few in number and the details lack definiteness as well as consistency because of the difficulty of getting unbiased information. The chief difficulty lies in the inability of the women themselves to eliminate the extrinsic or social stimulating or inhibiting factors that arise in their daily lives. The view that the sex urge in the human species is largely or exclusively psychic arises from the fact that physical stimuli (hormones, e.g.) may be overridden by virtue of man's superior mental equipment. Already in monkeys and apes we see a diffusion over the cycle of the clearly defined estrus of lower mammals and an obscuring of the picture through non-sexual social relations between individuals. Typically, however, in the monkey, as is to be expected on teleological grounds, the height of the curve of sex responsiveness occurs about the time of ovulation.

Among the first to study this phenomenon in women was Katharine B. Davis who sent questionnaires to 2200 women and tabulated the data. Hamilton later interviewed 100 men and 100 women and Tinklepaugh published a short but interesting series of carefully studied cases. The upshot of these studies is that women think they are most interested in sex relations soon after and just before the menstrual flow.

If one analyze these data more fully, however, it is possible to relate the premenstrual rise of desire to the concurrent rise in the level of the female sex hormone (estrin) circulating in the blood. The Stopes curve of desire which has the first rise near the middle of the cycle or, as we shall see presently, around the time of ovulation, is more nearly physiological. I regard the answers of most women to the effect that the greatest urge comes right after menstruation as being influenced by the practice of early resumption of sex relations following the conventional abstinence during the menstrual flow and the consequent satiation which obscures the real or physiological rise of desire at the midinterval, namely that conditioned by the high level of sex hormones in the circulating blood at this time. The Stopes curve is the truer picture, in my opinion, because this author eliminated the satiation factor by interviewing women during the absence of their husbands in the army. The orthodox Jewish schedule, it may be noted further, brings the mating period of the cycle nearer the physiological and psychological optimum.

Despite these uncertainties with reference to the cycle of libido in normal women we should not criticize women for their change of mood from day to day but should recognize the inherent cyclical nature of their physical and mental being.

At times the change of mood may be pathological because of excessive or defective sex hormones. Take the manifestations of premenstrual tension, for example, in which the proverbial rolling pin may be periodically

much in evidence. If the condition is due, as has been suspected but not actually proved, to a lack of progesterin, relief is at hand, for the appropriate hormone is now commercially available. Such attempts to correlate gynecological and biological studies with periodical appearance of disturbing mental states are only to be commended. The biologist and the synthetic chemist are ready to furnish the appropriate hormones that would seem to be indicated. It is not being oversanguine, in my judgment, to expect alleviation of some cyclically appearing mental aberrations to come from a judicious application of hormone therapy. Already, it may be added, women who have entered the menopause with distressing symptoms are being eased through the difficult years by means of synthetic sex hormones.

One more phase of the menstrual cycle must be discussed for its importance sociologically, namely the time of ovulation. It is apparent that knowledge on this point could be taken advantage of both for attaining and avoiding pregnancy. At this moment, therefore, the ascertainment of the time of ovulation is of great concern to thousands. This is particularly true of those who, while finding it necessary to limit their families, yet prefer, for religious or esthetic reasons, to reject artificial (chemical and mechanical) methods of contraception and choose the so-called "natural method" of total abstinence during the fertile (ovulatory) period of the menstrual cycle. What pertinent data has science to offer?

At present the Ogino-Kraus method of calculating the day of ovulation is much in vogue, namely that of counting back 14 to 16 days from the next expected day of menstruation. Without going into any of the obvious defects of the method, it is as good as any thus far proposed inasmuch as the calculation brings the day of ovulation fairly near the middle of the cycle. All reliable and thoroughly objective data for man point to the middle of the cycle (around day 13 counting the first day of the flow as day 1, with a range from day 8 to day 20) as the time of ovulation. The evidence I have set forth in my book "Time of Ovulation in Women," 1936. In the hands of the average couple the "safe period" method of birth control is probably as effective as mechanical and chemical means, inasmuch as fraudulent manufacturers are, in most states, still allowed to prey upon suffering womanhood by trafficking in defective and therefore unreliable contraceptive materials. Certain it is in the "safe period" idea many a devout couple have something of a guide in their efforts to limit their families to such size as they can bring up in health and self respect. With the fear of unwanted pregnancies to a large extent removed, whether by one means or another, there is also removed one of the greatest foes to marital adjustment, hence the important social implications of the problems just outlined in this paper.



# Economic Bases of Family Life

By WILLIAM F. OGBURN

Department of Sociology, University of Chicago

THE family is usually thought of as consisting of husband and wife, with or without children. The *sine qua non* of the family is supposed to be sex, though sex relations may exist without the family. Two members of the same sex, however, do not marry and form a family. That is to say, the family is conceived as an institution with its central theme that of procreation. The family has many other functions than that of sex activity, of course. Although the family today is organized around the sex function, it must be remembered that the family performs many other functions, one of which is very clearly economic, since women are the housekeepers and men provide the home and the money to run it. In fact, nearly all of the great institutions in society perform many other functions than the one which is the reason for its existence. Thus, the church is organized around worship, but it may exercise functions of education or philanthropy or recreation. It is these other functions of the family that make it vary from age to age and from culture to culture. The Chinese, Turkish and English families are all different. The family in the modern city is different from what it was in Colonial America. The purpose of this paper is to examine the economic bases of the family and to show how variations in economic functions have led to variations in type of family organization. While admitting that there is a sex element in family life, it is not proposed to deal with this element, but rather to assume its presence and to show how the economic factor, and not the sex factor, may dictate variations in kinds of families.

Four types of families may be delineated. It is not the contention that there are no other types than these four or that one of these four in its perfect form is found everywhere. There are, of course, in-between types and these types appear with varying degrees of emphasis and mixture. These four types will be presented in the order of their occurrence.

*The Hunting Family.* Families among the apes have few, if any, economic functions. The pregnant female or the mother with young offspring is able to gather food, to take care of herself economically without the aid of the father. But the higher apes are very far removed biologically from man, and the earliest we know of man's social life is what we find among primitive peoples today who have extremely simple hunting cultures. They do some killing and trapping of animals with crude implements and they are likely to gather much of their food in the

form of roots, herbs, fruits, nuts, berries, greens, and so forth. That the family is an economic institution is clearly attested by the division of labor, which is a cardinal point developed by Adam Smith in his explanation of economic organization. In the early hunting families men do one set of tasks and women another. Usually the men are hunters, fishers, trappers and work with the skins, while women gather the roots and herbs, do the cooking and sometimes share with the men the preparation of food. There are, of course, a whole host of other duties which they perform, each one his own assigned task. It very rarely occurs that men and women both do the same tasks in the same culture. Thus, very early in the evolution of cultures we find the most important use made of the division of labor by this first economic organization, the conjugal family.

The society consists of a small band, often of ten or fifteen individuals or families. Their mode of life is generally not stable for any great length of time. It often occurs that they eat out an area or kill the available animal supply. In the course of a few years they move on a short distance to another location where they camp for a while. The core of this hunting family is husband, wife and children. If the life is particularly hazardous for the male, so that deaths produce excesses of females, there may be more than one wife. There are usually children in the families and elders are taken care of. The family is thus organized on a conjugal basis, with perhaps an occasional relative. In these simpler hunting cultures there is some recognition of kinship. The apes and other animals do not have this conception of kinship. The family of the simpler hunting cultures resembles in its structure then the family as we find it in the modern city today.

The economic life, while comparatively simple from the point of view of modern society, is nevertheless quite time-consuming. The food has to be gathered or killed. It must be prepared, and in the case of some animals this is quite an elaborate procedure. Great distances must be covered to find food. Weapons and tools must be made. Skins and other clothing must be prepared. Shelter must be provided. The unit in all of these economic activities is nearly always the family. If the game is very large, as for instance the walrus, a hunting party from the village becomes the unit for the production of this type of food. If the source of supply be a herd of gregarious animals such as the caribou, again hunting parties organized on



other than the family basis may follow the herd and make the slaughter. There are, of course, community feasts and the local community becomes, here and there, something of an economic institution. The individual seldom acts alone as an economic agent. He is practically always attached to some family and becomes a part of the family household. It is thus seen that the economic functions of the primitive hunters are divided between the community and the family, with the family organization probably accomplishing by far the greatest proportion of economic production.

*The Consanguinal Family.* This type of family is organized around the kinship principle rather more than around the sex principle. The blood tie seems stronger than the sex tie. This consanguinal family is not found generally in modern society. Hence it is a strange phenomenon to modern readers, but it must be recognized that it has existed for thousands of years and has been found among a very large portion of the peoples of the globe. A picture of the consanguinal family is found among the Iroquois Indians, where the family lived in a long house in which there were likely to be several married or unmarried daughters occupying a corner or a definite portion of the house. Very likely the house was presided over by an elderly female. The unit is rather large and may consist of several married partners. But the collection of individuals called the family centers around kinship.

It may be said that the consanguinal family is a collection of individuals held together by blood ties with a smattering of individuals drawn in on the basis of mating, whereas the conjugal family of early primitive hunters was based in the main on mating with a smattering of blood kin drawn in. The kinship tie and the sex tie are both present in the consanguinal family but the blood tie often takes precedence over the sex tie. Thus, if a man marries a girl and comes to live in her house with her people, he is considered part of the family, but not quite so close a member as one of the blood relatives. For instance, in the rearing of the child, the mother's family often has more authority than the father. Such is particularly the case if the mother has a brother living at home of whom she is fond, or who is capable. Her husband lives there, it is true, but he feels often a close tie to his own relatives who live in the same village and he will spend a certain amount of time with them.

There are occasional fragmentary types of consanguinal families in our own society, though it is not the standard. Sometimes the brother and sister or mother and daughter bond is extremely strong with a family, for example, which lives on the farm. The sister may bring her husband in to work on the farm, or the brother may bring his wife. The father or mother may be living, and the property is in the hands of the family. The family

ties may be particularly strong between them, having existed for many years, and the new mates are sometimes viewed slightly as newcomers. This type of family does not readily appear, of course, where a young couple start housekeeping in their own house and live apart. The consanguinal family, among the primitive peoples, is closely related to rules of residence.

How did the consanguinal family arise? It was partly due, undoubtedly, to the extension of the kinship principle, and it may be variously related to the living conditions. Anyone familiar with the affection of brothers and sisters or parents and children is of course aware of the very great strength of this emotion, which certainly compares favorably with the strength of the emotion which unites mates. It is particularly important to note, however, that there are a number of economic advantages inherent in the consanguinal family, and it might even be argued that economic conditions transformed the conjugal type of the early primitive hunters into the consanguinal family of the later hunting cultures and in early agriculture. The economic advantages are especially evident from the point of view of continuity of production. Where land is exploited and property is used in exploiting it, continuity is an asset. Such would be the case, let us say, in the early agricultural societies. The land would continue, with the consanguinal family, under the same family exploitation for generation after generation without a change. This is one of the basic ideas in the concept of home. It is a location where the offspring may remain or to which they may return if they go away. In the conjugal family we see that there is a process of continual disruption. A and B marry at, say, twenty years of age and create a family, which remains intact for, say twenty years before one of them dies. Children C and D are born and reared in the family, but at fifteen or twenty years of age they depart from the roof to set up new families which in turn last for twenty years, more or less. Their children go through the same process. When bands are wandering, when the gathering of food is relatively simple, and when there is little property to transmit, this conjugal family, which is alternately forming and breaking, serves passably well as an economic institution, but it is not very well suited for production when the wandering life is abandoned and a settled abode is taken upon a particular plot of land and where inventions, such as weaving, spinning, metal work, furniture-making, etc., have become sufficiently numerous to provide a considerable amount of property.

The consanguinal family is also very well adapted to principles of inheritance. The problem of the inheritance of land has always been a serious one. If it is divided up among the different members of the family, the property becomes quite small. Hence primogeniture has been resorted to a good deal. But under the consanguinal



family the land remains more or less the property, generation after generation, of the family. The same is true, more or less, with the inheritance of privileges and names, which count for a great deal among the primitive people.

It is interesting, therefore, to see that the principle of sex, which we today think of as the fundamental basis of the family union, becomes degraded as a binding force in the consanguinal family and that this degradation of sex and this exaltation of the blood tie is achieved in good part by the economic principle necessary in the continuous production of economic goods. Thus we see that the economic functions of life take up the family, which started as a conjugal institution, and turn it largely into a different type of organization.

*The Great Family.* In the course of time economic inventions evolved. Hunting and trapping all but disappeared as a type of livelihood. The gathering of berries and roots and cultivation with the digging stock were replaced by the plow. The larger domesticated animals which were found previously associated with the pastoral life were adopted by the farmer using the plow and there came to exist a type of agriculture which was not greatly different from that which we had in America during the 18th and the first part of the 19th century. But there were differences, to be noted later.

The consanguinal principle continued to operate, but usually under the dominance of the male. Migrations and opening up of new lands led to the establishment of new families and somewhat of a revival of the conjugal principles. But the important point in the delineation of the great family lies on another plane than that on which the two principles of the conjugal and the consanguinal classification rest. The distinguishing characteristics of the great family lay in its attempt to adapt the family organization to large-scale production. There have frequently existed advantages in large-scale production, and this has come about in part because of the desire of mankind to possess more property. One of the problems of economic production is the labor supply. A rich farmer always has this problem, particularly when money has not been invented, or at least has not come into wide use, and the payment of wages by day or week in terms of money does not exist. The farmer who wanted to increase his lands had the problem of increasing his labor supply at the same time. One of the standard ways of doing this was to have a lot of children. Many of the agricultural peoples, particularly the rich, had a doctrine of large families, because it meant a good labor force to work the lands. The parents and children, in these early times when the death rate was high, seldom amounted to more than a half dozen or more working adults, although a large number of children may have been born. If a man was diligent and his wife was thrifty, and he was in a position because of these qualities to get more land, there was a strong

tendency to keep his sons and daughters with their mates at home. In order to increase his labor supply he would try to attach to his estate cousins and nieces and nephews and their mates, as well as aunts and uncles. The family was thus measured laterally as well as vertically and where the holdings were large, the family became truly a great family, comprising sometimes twenty or thirty persons in the family household.

Evidence of this type of family is found in the literature of ancient law, such as that discussed by Sir Henry Sumner Maine. It is the type found widely over the rural districts of China today. Professor Buck in his book *Chinese Farm Economy* has some tables showing extremely close correlation between the size of the family and the size of land holdings.

During the rise and flowering of the plow culture, the number of economic duties performed around the farm became quite great. Spinning and weaving were highly developed arts at this time. The preparation of leather called for much skill. Furniture-making, the preparing of tools, sewing, preserving foods and canning, the making of medicines were all part of the tasks of the family of this time. There always seems to have been plenty to do on the part of this self-sustaining family where the plane of living was relatively high. Consequently, there was a tremendous demand for workers because wealth was correlated extremely closely with the number of skilled workers.

The great family, then, like the consanguinal family, often included a good many married couples. That sex was subdued to the economic principle in the great family is also quite clear when we observe the almost universal practice of the arrangement of marriages by parents, rather than by the prospective mates themselves, with an especial eye to property considerations. Dowries were the outcome of this situation. It reached a point at times when marriages would be contracted while the prospective mates were still infants. Thus the bride and bridegroom had nothing to say about the matter. A prosperous farmer was, however, generally desirous of getting a capable and industrious worker as a wife for his son, and especially one who would bring some property to his own household. The same motives were evident in the choice of a husband for a daughter. Romantic love plays very little rôle in the formation of the family when the family is making such an heroic effort to expand its organization to meet the growing needs of mass production. I do not mean to imply that there were not poor families with small holdings, for there were many of these. Nor do I wish to indicate that the large family was the only way of accumulating wealth.

Other ways were through slaveholdings, as was found in the southern states of the United States. Still another widespread device was that common in the feudal system,



where the economic organization of society was tied up with policing and warfare. The great lords warred upon one another, conquered territory and exacted tribute from the farmers. This tribute was in the form of shares of the crop, but also in the form of military service which was said to be for the purpose of defense against other warlords who might harry the coasts and burn the grain. Thus these warlords acquired considerable property by exploiting other families and accumulated greater wealth than they could themselves gather by simply expanding their family laterally to a number of relatives.

With the family thus trying to become a larger and larger economic unit of production, there developed a number of correlative activities. The villages of the time were small and there were practically no houses other than family dwellings. There were occasionally churches and later on an occasional inn. Almost all functional community activities that took place in houses had to take place in family dwellings. It was even customary to find church services held in the dwellings. I recall seeing a jail in an old house outside of Baton Rouge in Louisiana, which was one of forty-three rooms in the house. This was a place to incarcerate recalcitrant slaves. In Europe occasionally the church even was on the property of a landed estate and the minister was taken care of by a particular family to which he was attached. Education naturally took place on the farm, particularly as that was the most convenient place to learn vocations. Where more refined education was needed, there were of course no schoolhouses, and in the later stages of this culture, tutors were brought to live in the family. Since there were no theatres, parks, opera houses, or poolrooms, recreation took place usually in the homestead, the center of the family life. The family was a source of security and afforded protection for children, widows, and elders. Particularly was the family the one great agency for giving status to the individual. If a person belonged to a prominent family in a relatively stationary society his position was secure. The family felt it necessary to look after him if he became weak or got into trouble and all the family resources were given to maintaining the family name up to the reputation which it had in the community. It became, of course, highly desirable to marry into a family with good status and to make a connection with another family that had good status. Marriages are today arranged among royalty in Europe in this manner. All these economic and correlated activities, then, are a far cry from the simple sex motif of married life.

*The Modern City Family.* There came a time when the family was utterly too small to man the production unit in economic life. The great boost to the expansion of production was the use of steam as a mechanical power when applied to metal tools. We are all familiar with how a machine can make hundreds and thousands of

replicas in very quick time. A paper of pins can be made in a few minutes by a machine, when it would take weeks to make it by hand. With transportation, the markets of the world expanded and cities arose. Hence, large units of production were needed. The source of this power was the steam boiler which was too large to put in the cellar of a house. Consequently, big houses called factories were built around the boiler. Thus the factory became the unit of production, instead of the homestead. A factory may have 500 or 5,000 employees, but it is very difficult to gather that many relatives together around the home to produce the necessary goods. What did the factory produce? The goods that were formerly being produced by handicraft methods within the family. Hence, production tended to leave the family and go outside into the factory.

One of the earliest occupations to leave the family was the making of leather, which went to tanneries. Furniture-making also soon went outside the home. Even prior to the coming of steam, metal working had left the home to be taken up by outside specialists dealing in this type of work. A most important exodus was spinning and weaving. Sewing is now done largely outside the home. The making of women's clothes has been a comparatively recent departure, somewhat more recent than the making of men's suits and coats. The preparation of medicines passed out of the home quite a long time ago and about half the laundering is now done in outside laundries. Cooking is in process of departure, though how far it may go is a question. About eighty percent of the baking is now done in factories called bakeries, and one meal a day in most city families is taken away from home. Restaurants, hotels and delicatessen stores are evidences of the departure of cooking from the home. Canneries are also an index of considerable loss of this function.

The result of this flight of industry from the family means a tremendous shrinkage of the family. We now hear about the great family only in the storybooks or from what our grandparents or great-grandparents recall. And with the departure of the economic functions have gone the various correlated functions, for just as steam has produced restaurants, laundries, factories, tanneries and drugstores, so also it has produced railroad stations, hotels, clubs, theatres, auditoriums, etc. There is plenty of room for these many social activities to take place in outside buildings, so that they do not have to occur in the home.

These economic forces, then, which picked up the conjugal family of the primitive hunters and molded it around the consanguinal principle and then blew it up into the great family, have withdrawn with a suddenness that amounts almost to a collapse. Almost overnight we see the modern city family returned to the conjugal type



of the days of the early hunters of primitive society.

The city family is usually not much interested in the kinship principle. Relatives who visit the city family may not always be welcome. They may stay too long and the family feels that dependent relatives ought to be supported by the state or some other agency. Indeed, the city family, since it is no longer an economic organization, is not very well equipped either to use or to take care of relatives. Consequently, there is a degradation of the kinship principle to a very low point, though not as is found among the apes. The functions of the great family have broken up and dispersed and the fragments have been collected in factories of various types.

The great principle, then, that is left to the family is the conjugal one. The family is today essentially a mating unit with very few functions, its most important one being the education and rearing of children, where there are children.

It is very interesting to compare the economic functions of the family of early primitive cultures and those of the modern city family. In its extreme form, the modern city family, I think, has fewer economic functions than the family of the primitive hunters. I doubt if there has ever been a family in the world which has had so few economic functions as the modern family living in apartment houses in the great cities. As a result of the absence of economic functions, there is a corresponding emphasis on the sex motive. Romantic love is the basis on which

marriages are formed in the modern city family and it would be considered strange by young women and men today to have their marriage partners chosen for them by their parents when they were infants. Since the family has little economic function, it can be formed relatively late in life and there is no great opposition to the children forming a separate family and living in a different place. Indeed, the family has so few functions that it is often considered proper by the romanticists today for the mates to separate as soon as love leaves the home. Consequently, many families break up within a few years after they are contracted, since the economic tie does not hold them together. This is particularly the case where there are no children.

The modern city family has returned to the type of family found among the simplest hunters. The modern city family has also become something of a wanderer, much like the primitive hunter. For in most of the large cities today a family moves on the average of about every two years. The modern family living in an apartment house in a large city is less an economic unit, so far as production is concerned, than the family of the primitive hunters was.

In conclusion, then, the discussion of these four types of families shows that though the sex element is present in all of the types, the organization of the family is made to vary greatly from culture to culture by the changes in the economic forces of society.

---

#### BOARD OF ADVISORY EDITORS

ADOLF MEYER, M.D.

ETHEL R. McDOWELL

LAWRENCE K. FRANK

HENRY PRATT FAIRCHILD

ERNEST R. GROVES

SIDONIE M. GRUENBERG

ELLSWORTH HUNTINGTON

PAUL POPENOE

ARTHUR J. TODD

#### LIVING

Published Quarterly by

THE NATIONAL CONFERENCE ON FAMILY RELATIONS

Editorial and Business Office

1126 E. 59th St., Chicago, Illinois

E. W. BURGESS, Acting Editor



# From the Conferences

## Abstract of Paper

*The Role of the Family Agency in Counselling, Helen C. White, Institute of Family Service.*—In view of the rapid multiplication of counselling bureaus throughout the country, it is important to discuss the role of the family agency in meeting the human need so revealed. The importance of the highest professional skill and standards in such a service should be especially stressed. The unprofessional and commercial character of the radio broadcast features, which attempt to render a counselling service, are dangerous in their potentially destructive influences.

Differences among counselling services that have a trained personnel lie essentially in emphases and in methods of approach and procedure, rather than in fundamental objectives or philosophy. The primary interest of all is focused upon the individual, his relationship to his family and to his broader social environment. Primary goals in service or in treatment are the prevention of breakdowns or disorganization, the conservation of personal integrity, of strengths already present, the building in of new and more lasting ones geared to and limited by capacities.

In its basic concept of the service of counselling, the family casework agency, first stresses the individual as a "self" in his own right. It recognizes as unique the qualities which make up his personality. It perceives the inner strivings through which he reaches out to establish himself in his own small niche. But it sees him also as biologically and emotionally rooted to those relationships through which he has his very being, and which, free though he would be and may become, will cast their threads of influence into his entire life experience.

The family agency's role may be defined as one of helping people to meet and to adjust their every-day problems of life, problems which arise in their social environment; sickness, unemployment, the death or desertion of wage earner, the lack of vocational guidance and training; problems also, which, springing from inner feelings, color and affect the individual's attitude toward those who constitute his world. The relationship, therefore, of husband to wife, parents to children, children to each other, the form and meaning these relationships may assume, the effect

they may exert upon emotional growth and attitudes and upon the individual's capacity for self-maintenance in its broad sense—these are all important factors in the fulfillment of the worker's role.

The family caseworker is a college and professional school graduate. If she is a beginner, she is closely associated with persons of wider and longer experience. Usually such experience has been not alone in the family field but in other fields of social work. She has acquired a body of knowledge and accepts as essential to growth the need for continued study. In this search for a wider horizon she turns to many allied fields—psychiatry, psychology, physical health, social economy, and to those which may enrich her understanding of, and sensitivity to cultural backgrounds and mores. She must have deep feeling for people and an abiding faith in them. Her task calls for a delicate balance of perception and sensitivity. Knowledge of behavior motivation is essential. Its application to treatment, however, must be restricted to the casework field, with an ever-present alertness to limitations beyond which ventures must not be pursued without the guidance of specialists. Essential also is an understanding of what the community offers in the way of resources for meeting clientele needs.

Modification of the place of relief in the family agency's service and of the client attitude toward the relief function is now taking place, due in part to the rise of the public agency in this field and to the fact that widespread distress during the depression has for many removed the sense of stigma in purely material need. The family agency regards relief as a constructive tool, as a channel through which, with wise administration, relationships could be strengthened, tensions eased and the individual freed to "walk without fear." In some instances relief is given to the extent of full maintenance, more often to supplement income; but there is an increasing number of clients—some in the substantial income brackets—who come to the family agency with problems unrelated to money.

Paper presented at the New York State Conference on Marriage and the Family, April 29.



# News and Notes

## National, Regional and State Conferences

*The National Conference on Family Relations.*—The second annual meeting was held in Philadelphia December 26 to 29, with members in attendance from Maine to California and from Wisconsin to Louisiana. The sessions were held in the auditorium and class rooms of the Pennsylvania School of Social Work, Social Service Building, which houses a large number of the welfare agencies of the city. Coöperating in the conference were the following organizations: Marriage Counsel, Pennsylvania School of Social Work (affiliated with the University of Pennsylvania), The Family Society of Philadelphia, The Institute of the Pennsylvania Hospital, The Jewish Welfare Society, and the Philadelphia Child Guidance Clinic.

At the first session of the Conference Tuesday morning, presided over by Frederick H. Allen, M.D., director, Philadelphia Child Guidance Clinic, Adolf Meyer, M.D., president of the National Conference, struck the keynote of the sessions in his introductory address, emphasizing the importance of synthesizing the contributions of specialists who are studying the family from different points of view and by different methods of research.

Dr. Sidney E. Goldstein, chairman, New York State Conference on Marriage and the Family, in his paper "The Family as a Dynamic Factor in American Society," stressed both the social significance of the family and the need of its conservation by government action. Dr. Una Bernard Sait, Claremont College, in her paper "Democracy and the Family" applied the philosophy of John Dewey to the realities of family living.

Simultaneous meetings of Conference Committees took place Tuesday afternoon. The following committees with their chairmen were: The Economic Basis of Family Life, William Hodson, Commissioner of Public Welfare, New York City; Education for Marriage and Family Living, Ernest R. Groves, University of North Carolina; Eugenics and the Family, Frederick Osborn, American Eugenics Society; Marriage and Family Counselling, Mrs. Stuart Mudd, Marriage Counsel, Philadelphia; Marriage and Family Law and Its Administration, Max Rheinstein, University of Chicago; Marriage and Family Research, Joseph K. Folsom, Vassar College; Youth and Its Problems, Oliver M. Butterfield, New York. In these meetings reports by the chairmen and by others were presented and discussed.

At the dinner meeting in the Hotel Sylvania the American Eugenics Society held a Symposium on "Eugenics and the Family," with Frederick Osborn, presid-

ing, Dr. Frank Notestein, lecturer on Population of the School of Public Affairs, Princeton University, gave an address on "The Development of Population Policies in the United States."

At the evening session Tuesday night President Adolf Meyer presided. Carle C. Zimmerman, Harvard University, in his address "The Family in Different Types of Societies: Totalitarian, Communist, and Democratic," compared the trends of modern family life in those countries where the family is undergoing the greatest changes. In his paper "The Family as a Cultural Agent," Lawrence K. Frank, New York City, described the role of the family in mediating social change. Max Rheinstein, University of Chicago Law School, in his address "The Family, the State and the Law" pointed out the conflict between the modern theory of law which takes the individual as the legal unit and the actuality of the family as the basic social unit.

Wednesday noon the members of the National Conference attended a luncheon meeting of the Philadelphia Marriage Counsel, where Karen Horney, M.D., New York, in a penetrating address "Enslavement in Marriage" analyzed the psychological factors in certain problems in the relation of husband and wife.

In the afternoon session, with President Meyer presiding, the chairmen of the committees presented reports which had been prepared in the morning sessions of these committees.

At the final session Wednesday evening, with Geoffrey May, Social Security Board, presiding, Carl G. Hartman, M.D., Johns Hopkins University, in his paper "The Biological Basis of the Family" described graphically with slides the menstrual cycle in its relation to conception. William F. Ogburn, University of Chicago, in his address on "The Economic Basis of Family Life" contrasted the economic conditions of modern society with those of previous types of social organization. In his closing address "The Family as Unity," President Meyer summarized the contributions of the Conference.

Two business meetings were held. At the first meeting on Tuesday, the secretary reported that the members of the society had adopted by mail ballot the revision of three articles of the Constitution which enlarged the Advisory Council to include in its membership the presidents of regional and state organizations and which set up a board of directors to have general charge of the work of the National Conference. The Advisory Council will now have responsibility for the develop-



ment of regional, state and local conferences and have responsibility also for advising the Board of Directors upon matters pertaining to the welfare of the Conference. The Constitution as revised will be published in the spring issue of *LIVING*.

At this meeting it was also announced that five life memberships in the National Conference had been established as the result of an offer by an anonymous donor obtained by former President Paul Sayre to give the amount necessary for one life membership provided funds could be secured for four additional life memberships. Through the contributions of over seventy members of the Conference the necessary funds were secured and life memberships were issued for former President and Mrs. Paul Sayre, President and Mrs. Adolf Meyer, Professor and Mrs. Ernest R. Groves and Dr. Sidney E. Goldstein. The donor asked that his life membership be issued for E. W. Burgess.

In making the report of the Committee on Life Members, L. Guy Brown, Oberlin College, stated that through these life memberships the members of the Conference were both honoring leaders in the field of family relations and providing funds essential for the development of the work of the Conference. He further stated that the donor had made a further contribution of ten dollars each toward establishing eight additional life memberships and that efforts would be made during the coming year to raise the additional funds required.

The officers elected for the year 1940 are: president, Adolf Meyer M.D., John Hopkins University; vice-president, Ernest R. Groves, University of North Carolina; secretary-treasurer, E. W. Burgess, University of Chicago.

*White House Conference on Children in a Democracy.*—The final meeting of the White House Conference was held in Washington, D.C. January 18–20. The general conference report, prepared by the report committee, Homer Folks, chairman, with the aid of a research staff headed by Philip Klein, was presented for discussion and action.

The report was divided into eleven sections, four of which were devoted to family life and the child: families and their incomes, families in need of assistance, families and their dwellings and the family as the threshold of democracy. The other sections of the report were upon the subjects of religion, educational services, protection against child labor, youth and its needs, conserving the health of children, children under special disadvantages and public financing and administration.

The Conference adopted the general report with few alterations. The chief recommendations were: a demand for immediate ratification of the Federal Child Labor amendment; assistance to boys and girls in work projects to include those on parole from reformatories or on pro-

bation; opening of membership rolls of the CCC which have been closed to such youths; adoption by the Federal government of a policy of continuing and flexible work programs; coöperation of state and local government to provide work for parents among the needy unemployed; improving family dwellings and the housing situation; practical steps to make available better religious instruction for all children; realignment of school units to assure the best possible education for all children and a fair method of assessing taxes for education; proper supervision of health and extension of facilities for medical care and protection with emphasis on maternal and infant care. In its summary of recommendations, which will be incorporated into a program of action for the next ten years, the Conference stated that it had no misgivings about this nation's "capacity to face unpleasant facts, its will to take on new responsibilities, and its readiness to accept great burdens."

The significance of the White House Conference will depend largely upon the extent to which the recommendations made will be carried into effect. Regional and state conferences of the National Conference on Family Relations are urged to include at least one session in their programs to be devoted to a discussion of the findings and recommendations of the White House Conference.

*National Youth Administration Conference.*—A conference of leaders in business, education and labor held in Washington, D.C., December 13–14, recommended an increase in public expenditures for the employment of the nation's four million jobless young people.

After two days of discussion, the Conference, called by Security Administrator Paul V. McNutt, adopted a program for increasing the public employment of persons between the ages of 16 and 25, and named a committee to determine "the amount which can properly be recommended for the enlargement of the program of the National Youth Administration." The committee is headed by Henry I. Harriman, of Boston, former president of the U. S. Chamber of Commerce.

The conference report was as follows:

There is in the United States an urgent problem arising from the widespread unemployment of youth. The conference is firmly convinced, on the basis of a number of comprehensive studies which have been made and reported and as a result of the experience of the American people in recent years, that immediate and vigorous action is necessary if very serious consequences to the nation are to be avoided. One-third of the young people of this country between the ages of 16 and 25 who are out of school are unable to secure employment. At least 4,000,000 young people between these ages are out of school and unemployed. This constitutes between one-third and one-half of the total unemployed in this country.



The conference is also convinced that all young people who are out of work and out of school must be provided with opportunities for employment or with opportunities for assistance to continue in school. Employment should, so far as possible, be provided by private business, industry, and agriculture. To the extent to which private enterprise does not provide jobs for youth who are out of school, unemployed, and seeking work, public employment should be provided.

When young people are employed through the use of public funds, work projects should be selected, so far as possible, which are not in competition with private enterprise. These work projects should be such as contribute to the needs of youth and to the public welfare.

The program provided by the educational system in all its branches should be so organized as to emphasize useful work experiences gained through coöperation with business, agriculture, and public employment.

The development of an adequate program for the realization of the plan of work and training here outlined requires not only participation by the Federal Government but also participation in local communities of representative citizens who will take effective action to meet so far as possible the situations with regard to unemployed youth that exist in these communities.

It is quite impossible to meet the urgent needs of unemployed young people of the present time without the expenditure of larger sums of public money than are now devoted to the solution of the employment problems of young people.

The conference recommends that an investigation be conducted by a committee of this conference to determine the amount which can properly be recommended for the enlargement of the program of the National Youth Administration so that it shall not be limited, as it now is, in providing for unemployed youth.

This committee is also directed to consider what steps should be taken to carry out the arrangements that are now being organized between the work projects of the National Youth Administration and educational institutions.

*National Conference of the Progressive Education Association.*—The Parents' Program of the Conference, planned by The Association for Family Living, devoted to the subject "Resources and Education: Can the Family Meet the Needs of Children?" was held in Chicago, February 21.

The morning meeting on the subject "Current Findings Reflecting the Needs of Children," chairman, Mrs. Benjamin F. Langworthy, former president National Congress of Parents and Teachers, included papers on "Basic Needs of Little Children," Grace Langdon, Family Life Education, Works Progress Administration, Washington, D.C.; "The Seeds of Dictatorship and Democ-

racy in the Child's Environment," Harold Anderson, University of Illinois; "What do Children Want to Know About Sex?" J. A. Conn, Johns Hopkins Hospital; "Emotional Adjustment of Adolescents," Caroline Zachry, Progressive Education Association.

The luncheon meeting on "Wider Approaches to Meeting Children's Needs," Joseph K. Folsom, chairman, was addressed by John N. Washburne, Syracuse University; and Rua Van Horn, Home Economics Education Service, United States Office of Education.

The afternoon meeting on "Some Resources Available to Parents in Meeting Children's Needs," chairman, Lavinia S. Schwartz, Midwestern Educational Director, Columbia Broadcasting System, presented demonstrations and exhibits on a specific subject of family interest by movies, radio, museums and libraries, with a panel on "The Utilization of these Media" by William D. Boutwell, Division of Radio Publications and Exhibits, Office of Education, Washington, D. C.; James Mitchell, Commission on Human Relations; Dr. Henry Otto, Kellogg Foundation; Ann Ford, script writer; Sidonie M. Gruenberg, Director, Child Study Association of America; Mrs. H. M. Mulberry, Illinois Congress of Parents and Teachers; a youth representative; and Hilda Taba, Progressive Education Association Evaluation Staff.

Following this program there was scheduled an informal meeting of the National Council of Parent Education, Joseph K. Folsom, president.

Two consultation conferences on parent education were held February 22, chairman, Evelyn Millis Duvall, executive director, Association for Family Living.

The resource leaders for the morning conference on "Problems in Parent Education" were: Joseph Folsom; Sidonie M. Gruenberg; Helen Koch, University of Chicago Nursery School; Grace Langdon; George Mohr, M.D., psychiatrist, Chicago; Irene B. Needham, Elizabeth McCormick Memorial Fund; and Conrad Sommer, M.D., Illinois Society for Mental Hygiene; and for the afternoon conference "Approaches in Parent Education:" Ruth Andrus, New York State Bureau of Child Development; Edna Dean Baker, National College of Education; Mrs. Harry M. Mulberry; Ralph H. Ojiman, Iowa Child Welfare Research Station; Perry Dunlap Smith, North Shore Country Day School; Frances Bruce Strain, author and specialist in sex education; and Edna Walls, Illinois State Extension Department.

*Los Angeles Institute of Family Relations.*—The Institute presented an all-day conference on Modern Marriage and the Modern Family at the University of Southern California, February 3, 1940.

The morning session on the general theme "Looking Forward to Marriage" was introduced by an address by Paul Popenoe which was followed by round table discussions led by Roswell H. Johnson, Mrs. C. Brooks Fry,



Herbert Popenoe, Mrs. Lester E. Lubnow, Henry C. Roney, and George D. Nickel. The afternoon session upon the topic "What Is Happening to the Family" consisted of round table discussions led by George B. Mangold, E. O. Palmer, Donald McLean, Christopher G. Ruess, Mrs. Gertrude S. Hasbrouck, Mrs. Fenna B. Simms, D. D. Eitzen, and Dr. Hulsey Cason. The evening session on the subject, "The Conservation of the Family," was introduced by an address by Paul Popenoe, followed by discussion groups led by D. P. Wilson, Mrs. Erma Pixley, Mrs. C. Brooks and Roswell H. Johnson.

*New York State Conference on Marriage and the Family.*—The fourth annual meeting of the New York State Conference will be held April 12–13 in New York City. The program, according to present plans, will consist of three general sessions. The attention of the Conference will be focused upon the presentation and discussion of three important topics: the first session on the evening of April 12 will be devoted to the subject of "Youth and Marriage," with a program based on a series

of discussions by young people held prior to the meeting. The morning meeting on April 13 will consider "Personality Adjustment Within Marriage and the Family Today." The luncheon and evening meeting will consider the findings and recommendations of the White House Conference.

Members of the National Conference on Family Relations, particularly those residing in eastern states, are invited to attend. Requests for programs should be sent to Sidney E. Goldstein, chairman, New York State Conference on Marriage and the Family, 40 West 68th Street, New York City.

*Conference on the Conservation of Marriage and the Family.*—The Sixth Annual Conference will be held April 9–12, 1940, at Chapel Hill, North Carolina. Invitations will be sent out in February. The University of North Carolina and Duke University are coöperating in holding this Conference. For information about the Conference write Ernest R. Groves, director, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, North Carolina.

## Meetings and Events

*American Home Economics Association.*—At the 1939 annual meeting of the Association three specific objectives were recommended: housing, consumer education, children in a democracy. These will be reported upon at the meeting to be held in Cleveland, June 23–27.

*Association for Family Living.*—The Association held at its headquarters in Chicago a seminar for parents entitled "The Family: From Past to Future." Meetings held weekly beginning January 15 were on the following topics: "Families—Yesterday and Today," Ernest W. Burgess, University of Chicago; "The Changing Family—Its Impact on the Individual," by Evelyn Millis Duvall, The Association for Family Living, and Helen Shacter, Northwestern University; "Fundamental Challenges Facing the Present Day Family," Eduard Lindeman, New York School of Social Work; and "What is the Modern Family Trying to Do?" a panel discussion by Aletha M. Coffman, Diana I. Holzheimer, Evelyn Millis Duvall and Sora Barth Loeb of the staff of the Association for Family Living.

*Beloit College.*—Seventy-five seniors are taking a course in marriage and the family this semester.

*Bradford Junior College.*—The College offered its first course on family relationships in the college year 1929–30. This was an elective but required of everyone in home economics and was given in the home economics department.

*Chicago Association for the Study and Advancement of Individual Psychology.*—The Association is giving, beginning January 30, a discussion course on "Love and Marriage" of six lectures by Dr. Rudolf Dreikurs.

*Drexel Institute of Technology in Philadelphia.*—The Institute initiated a course in planning for marriage during the school year 1938–39. Walter Obold of the department of biology and Oscar Wesley of the department of sociology joined with a number of outside speakers representing medicine, psychiatry, sociology and social work in giving the lectures and conducting discussions.

*Duke University.*—The seminar course given by John S. Bradway, in the Law School on family law is now open to sociology students from the University of North Carolina and Duke University. Last year the group of seven law students and five graduate sociology students discussed a model divorce system for North Carolina. The first half of the course was devoted to reading by each group in the field of the other and the second half to reports by members of the class regarding certain phases of the divorce field. The clash of ideas and the opportunity for each group to explore the field of the other provided a most interesting experience.

*Eastern North Carolina Council on Family Relations.*—A council on Family Relations has recently been organized at Greenville, North Carolina, to serve eastern North Carolina. The chairman of the council is M. L. Wright, and the secretary is Katharine Holtzclaw.

*Essex Junior College.*—The extension division of general education offered a course "The Psychology of Marriage" last autumn by Dr. A. M. Koch, the first course of its kind ever given in a higher institution of learning in the state of New Jersey. Its presentation was followed by similar courses being offered at various



adult education centers and various other institutions.

*The Greenwich Marriage Counsel Bureau.*—The Bureau was established at 38 Arch Street in the spring of 1937 by the members of the Board of The Greenwich Committee for Maternal Health, Inc. Dr. A. Louise Brush, psychiatrist and counselor is at the Bureau Tuesday afternoons of each week for consultations. During the week the Bureau is open for making appointments and for interviews with the assistant counselor.

There are three types of service at the Bureau; The first is, pre-marital counsel: individuals contemplating marriage are given an opportunity to clarify their own ideas about themselves and each other in relation to marriage, so that they may be helped to gain a better understanding of marriage, its possibilities, responsibilities and its limitations. The second is, marriage counsel: (ideally an outgrowth of Premarital Counsel): married people discuss their difficulties and problems, methods of handling them and ways of making the most of the constructive side of the situation. They learn to know themselves better and more readily to understand each other. The third is psychiatric consultation and treatment.

*Mt. Holyoke College.*—A new course in sociology on marriage and the family is being offered for the second time to meet a growing demand on the part of students.

*The National Association of Housing Officials.*—The Association recently reported on the median incomes of tenant families in five housing projects financed by the U. S. Housing Authority in three cities. In a Jacksonville housing project the median family income fell in the \$600 to \$799 per year group; in Austin, Texas, in the \$400 to \$599 group (in two housing projects); in Buffalo, New York, in the \$800 to \$999 group, also in two projects. These figures should give pause to those critics who loudly proclaim that the new public housing is not meeting the needs of low income families.

*Ohio State University.*—Interest in the course on "The Family" has increased greatly in the past several years. "The Family" is the only advanced course in the department of sociology that is taught every quarter of the year and its enrollment now surpasses that of any other advanced course in the department. During the past four quarters 165 students have been in the course and registration for this autumn quarter is twenty-five percent above registration for the same quarter last year.

Besides the course on "The Family" in the department of Sociology, the University conducts a non-credit pro-

gram in marriage preparation which has an enrollment of about 50 students per quarter. Perry P. Denune is in charge of the departmental course and chairman of the committee in charge of the other program.

*University of Pennsylvania.*—Professor James H. S. Bossard's book on *Marriage and the Child*, has been published by the University of Pennsylvania Press.

*Peoria, Illinois.*—One of the Protestant churches has just completed a series of lecture discussions with a group of young people, mostly unmarried, on Sunday nights. Two ministers, one speaking on the subject of "Knowing Oneself" and the other "A Minister Looks at Love and Marriage," participated in the discussion. A physician was asked to discuss "The Physical Aspects of Marriage" and the Y. M. C. A. secretary spoke on the subject of "A Layman Looks at Love and Marriage." Dr. C. W. Schroeder, Bradley College, then presented a series of three lectures based on his own study of "Divorce in Peoria" and that of Burgess and Cottrell in the book *Predicting Success or Failure in Marriage*.

*Pomona College.*—As evidence of the increasing interest by students in college courses in marriage and family relations, the new course had to open three sections to accommodate the demand. The course is given by Professor Ray E. Baber, and is open only to juniors and seniors. Almost as many men as women enrolled for the course.

*Rutgers University.*—During January, February and March, the Homemakers' Forum Radio Program, sponsored by the New Jersey Home Economics Extension Service of the University, is presenting "Chats with Father" over WOR at 11:45 on Wednesdays. These broadcasts will be dialogues between a father and a specialist in child development and family-life relations.

*School of Domestic Arts and Sciences in Chicago.*—The School (organized and incorporated not for profit) offers a six weeks' Brides School twice a year. The young women are taught how to cook, serve meals, keep house; plan time and manage money, how to train servants and how to manage without them, how to buy food, furnishings, and wardrobes for husband and wife. Both married and unmarried students attend. There is a marked difference in the avidity with which the married students take the work as compared with the engaged, who still rest heavily upon the magic of romance. Mary Koll Heiner is the director.

## Personal Notes

Alice Tilson Adcock, Greenwood, Indiana, is conducting a discussion group with eighteen couples at the local Presbyterian Church twice a month. Indiana University

Extension Library and the Indiana State Library are co-operating by sending books and bulletins.

Lloyd V. Ballard, Beloit College, has been appointed



to the State Board of Public Welfare recently organized under a law centralizing the welfare services of the state in a single department of State Government.

Lawrence Clark has resigned from his position as head of the department of economics and sociology at Bethany College, Bethany, West Virginia, and is this year teaching sociology at Hunter College, New York City.

Dr. Moses Jung's book *Modern Marriage* which grew out of his course at the State University of Iowa is due for publication early in 1940. The contributors to the book are Carl E. Seashore, George D. Stoddard, Andrew Woods, E. D. Plass, Kurt Lewin and others.

Mabel Grier Leshner, M.D., is chairman, Education Committee, New Jersey Social Hygiene Association, and is a member of the National Education Committee American Social Hygiene Association.

Nadina R. Kavinsky, M.D., supervisor of Mother's Clinics, Los Angeles County, is lecturer for the following institutions: 1) course on medical problems of the family in the School of Medical Evangelists; 2) nurses, Huntington Memorial Hospital; 3) Graduate School of Social Work, University of Southern California; and 4) Y. M. and Y. W. C. A. groups on preparation for marriage.

Mrs. Grace Sloan Overton gave a series of five lectures on Marriage and Family Life at Purdue University the third week in November, which were attended by a daily average of 450 students.

Myra Sowell, assistant professor of home economics, North Texas State Teachers College, Denton, has been appointed as consultant in home and family life by the

W. K. Kellogg Foundation of Battle Creek, Michigan. Her duties were assumed February 1 and continue through May.

Miss Sowell will work in Allegan County in cooperation with various organizations interested in the field of home and family life. The Foundation has been, in former years, sending groups of parents to such centers as the Merrill-Palmer School in Detroit for conferences in various phases of family life. Allegan County plans to reach many more parents by placing a consultant in the county who will help in planning a program to meet the needs of local communities.

Mrs. Richard G. Williams, Vassar, A.B., University of Rochester, A.M., is director of family-life education for the Ohio Congress of Parents and Teachers; field worker in parent education; and is leader of discussion groups and lay leader training classes.

*An Outlined Study of Temple University's Joint Course on Marriage and Family Relationships* by J. Stewart Burgess is now available in mimeograph form. This report includes an analysis of a joint undertaking by five departments at Temple University; the history and development of the course; outlines of lectures; student's reactions; a brief description of seventy-three courses given in American colleges; an extensive bibliography; and a classified list of students' questions. This study may be secured at cost for \$.70 in stamps or money order. Address J. Stewart Burgess, Sociology Department, Temple University, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania for copies of the study.

## Democracy and the Family

(Continued from page 7)

will remember the descriptions of ideal family relations, not only in the home of M. and Mme. Curie, but in *both* their childhood homes.

Obviously, creative family living is an enterprise which demands the continuing devotion and harmonious cooperation of husband and wife. Marriage acquires enhanced significance when it is realized that the underlying structure of democratic family life is a developing psychological relationship between interdependent equals; where each seeks fulfillment of personality, not for himself or herself alone, but for the other; and where, at the same time, both strive to integrate their points of view, or at the least to reach a working agreement in all the areas of family life where cooperation is essential.

Parents who have achieved such harmony may make of home life a veritable laboratory for democratic living. Each child must be accepted for what he or she is: a new and uniquely valuable personality in the making; to be, so far as possible, sheltered from all harmful influences and

provided with all conditions necessary to sturdy, all-round development. Cooperation may be practiced from earliest childhood in a group where each child assumes, as early as possible, a just and appropriate share of work and responsibility. Both father and mother are needed as their children's companions, as their trusted guides and friends. Always alert to foster mental and emotional growth, and to encourage desirable social attitudes, wise and sympathetic parents may finally endow their children with the freedom of responsible maturity.

We may then face the future with confidence, and strong in the determination that the democratic family shall become the nuclear process in the democratic way of life. But we must not underestimate the magnitude of such an undertaking. The very fact that this conference has gathered together representatives from so many special fields proves how numerous and varied are the factors influencing family life. We are warned how much there yet remains to discover, how much to do. There will al-



ways be need for further research in all fields bearing on our central problem. But we are far, as yet, from making full use of such knowledge as we already have at our disposal. Attention must be concentrated along two directions of endeavor: first on education, including not only education for marriage and family living and parenthood, but education for participation in the democratic way of life; second, on social amelioration, through economic reorganization and legislation designed to provide security and opportunity for all, with the central emphasis on family and child welfare.

Finally, lest our present obligations appear overwhelming, it is encouraging to realize that we may rely for aid

on some of the most powerful and universal of human motives: the desire for happiness in marriage, and the love of parents for their children. In marriage, and even more in parenthood, men and women are led beyond themselves in sympathy with other lives; in sympathy which may expand in widening circles until it merges in a sense of participation in the life of humanity and the cause of freedom for the human spirit.

Much, indeed, depends upon the vital interests inherent in family relations. To us belongs the opportunity to devise the means by which they may become *more intelligent, and more responsible, and thus assured of fuller and freer expression.*

## The Family, the Law and the State

(Continued from page 20)

for the debts of the husband as well as of the wife. So many exceptions have been developed however, that the original idea has, to a large extent, been obliterated and the protection of creditors is only slightly better than that afforded them in those states which have adopted the English system.

For a long period of time the United States has been a debtor country, and while in recent years the East has completely changed its economic position and has gradually assumed financial leadership in the world, debtor interests still prevail in the West. This economic fact is reflected in numerous enactments intended to protect debtors against financial ruin. In addition to such devices as exemption laws, homestead laws, and moratorium acts, family law has been used to achieve similar results in an indirect way. It has been made impossible or difficult for married women to be sureties for or business partners of their husbands, and some states have preserved relics of the ancient contractual incapacity of married women with the result of making it difficult or frequently impossible for creditors to reach the property of the wife even where she has tried to make her credit available for her husband. In addition, the ancient dower interest of married women has been preserved in the Western states with the result that in the event of a financial breakdown of the husband, some small fraction of the family assets can be salvaged as a fund for a new start.

This dower interest serves another function, namely,

the function of protecting a wife against disinheritance by her husband. In some of the Eastern states, dower has been replaced, however, by a so-called statutory share of the wife in the husband's decedent estate which, although indefeasible by the husband's will, can be defeated by gifts from the husband to outsiders made during his lifetime. Even more precarious is the protection of children against disinheritance. While in all countries of continental Europe and Latin America, they are entitled to a share in the parents' decedent estate which cannot be defeated by will, in England and the United States this right of the children was abolished in the Seventeenth Century. Under present American law, a father may completely disinherit his children. Only in most recent years has a wave of remedial legislation appeared in English-speaking countries. It started in New Zealand whence it gradually spread to Canada and the other dominions, and finally reached England just this summer. This new British legislation has found great attention in this country and the prediction may be ventured that similar laws will probably be enacted in this country in the near future.

The National Conference on Family Relations could do useful work in opening a forum for the discussion of the problems discussed in this paper, in promoting studies of the law existing in the United States and abroad, and finally in cooperating in the drafting of model acts as a basis for legislation.